

# Native-speakerism in ELT: A case study of English language education in China

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of  
The University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy  
by

Junshuan Liu

May 2018

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The thesis could not have been accomplished without the constant encouragement, suggestions and criticisms from many others. At this moment, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to those who have provided help and guidance for my research during the past few years.

The deepest gratitude goes to my respectable supervisors, Dr. Songqing Li and Dr. Sofia Lampropoulou, who have offered thought-provoking guidance and effective support for my PhD project. In particular, they have introduced to me the paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This makes it feasible for me to gain an insight into the discriminatory and unethical issues reproduced by and reproducing Native-speakerism in the realm of English language teaching (ELT) in China and beyond, and renders it possible for further exploration of similar issues from the perspective CDA in my future teaching and research career. In addition to the supervision over my PhD research, Dr. Songqing Li has provided many suggestions on my career development.

I would like to express special gratitude to Dr. Rining Wei for his help with my using the software, SPSS, to analyze the numerical data. At the same time, I feel grateful to other faculty members of the English department, particularly Dr. Hui Yin, who offered me constant encouragement with my research work.

Thanks are also extended to my friend, Dr. Shaowey Young, for her care and support during the past few years. In addition, I appreciate the participation of the students, teachers and administrators in the questionnaire surveys and interviews. Without their support, data could not have been collected and this thesis could not have been accomplished.

To my family, I feel deeply indebted. Without the understanding and support of my wife and my son, I could not even have had chance to start my PhD study. Sincere thanks to my wife for her taking care of the family while I stayed away from home, conducting the PhD research; special thanks to my son for his academic success, which makes it possible for me to concentrate on my own research work.

Finally, I would like to thank all who have lent me a hand with my PhD work, though their names are not listed one by one. I am quite aware that this thesis is not merely the result of my personal efforts but the fruit of all those who are concerned.

I also understand that the completion of the thesis is not the end of my scholarly pursuit, but a new starting point of my academic career. I believe that my future achievement in research will be a concrete gratitude to all who have helped with my PhD work.

## ABSTRACT

Native-speakerism, an established chauvinistic ideology in the realm of English language teaching (ELT), has been encountering academic and institutional challenges in the past few decades. However, it remains underexplored whether – if so, to what extent – English as a foreign language (EFL) education in China is still affected by this ideology. This study adopts Critical Discourse analysis (CDA), particularly its discourse-historical approach (DHA) as a theoretical guideline to explore this issue by investigating the attitudes of three categories of Chinese ELT stakeholders – students, teachers and administrators – toward Native-speakerism in four interrelated thematic dimensions of ELT to do with teachers, English language varieties, cultural orientations and teaching approaches respectively.

Data were collected through questionnaire surveys and interviews from 817 non-English-major undergraduate students in different disciplinary areas, 68 College English (CE) teachers and eight CE program directors of six universities in a province located in North China. Data analysis indicates that the three participant groups, as an entirety, granted a prestigious status to native English speaker teachers (NESTs), particularly Anglo-American Caucasians, Inner Circle English, Inner Circle culture and teaching approaches rooted in Inner Circle countries, *inter alia*, the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. Meanwhile, most of the participants expected White NESTs for classroom teaching and upheld Inner Circle English as the learning/teaching target. Although expressing the desire to incorporate into ELT Outer and Expanding Circle cultures, especially traditional Chinese culture, and the conventional teacher-centered teaching approach of China, the participants took them merely as a supplement to Inner Circle culture and CLT. Furthermore, they asserted that offering higher salaries and greater respects to NESTs is not discriminatory, as is prioritizing Inner Circle linguaculture over its Outer and Expanding Circle counterparts. It was also felt that promoting CLT entails no prejudice against the traditional education culture of China. The reasons that most of the participants stated for their endorsing the nativeness principle in these four dimensions of ELT resonate with the conventional Native-speakerist ideology that valorizes Inner Circle English and the education culture of the English speaking West. In addition to these shared standpoints, some inter-group differences were located among the participants.

All these findings are indicative of a strong pro-nativeness mentality among the three participant groups, elucidating therefore that EFL education in China is still affected severely by Native-speakerism. Also represented in these findings are the lingering effects of the imbalanced historical-present relations between China and Inner Circle countries as well as the concomitant pro-nativeness ELT policies of China. While exposing the ideological terrain of China's EFL education, this study has implications for relevant future research and for those who are engaged in ELT to take measures to resist Native-speakerism.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	I
ABSTRACT .....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	VIII
LIST OF TABLES .....	IX
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 An emerging controversial situation .....	1
1.2 Research objectives .....	6
1.3 Research questions .....	6
1.4 EFL education in China .....	7
1.4.1 Prior to 1949 .....	7
1.4.2 From 1949 to 1999 .....	8
1.4.3 After 2000 .....	10
1.5 Structure of the thesis .....	14
CHAPTER 2 ATTITUDINAL AND CRITICAL STUDIES ON NATIVE-SPEAKERISM .....	17
2.1 Introduction .....	17
2.2 Attitudinal studies .....	18
2.2.1 Studies on Native-speakerism in four respects of ELT .....	18
2.2.2 Limitations .....	32
2.3 Critical studies .....	34
2.3.1 Four CDA studies on Native-speakerism .....	35
2.3.2 Limitations .....	38
2.4 Summary .....	40
CHAPTER 3 CDA AND THE DHA APPROACH .....	42
3.1 Introduction .....	42
3.2 CDA as a theoretical guideline .....	42
3.3 DHA as a methodological approach .....	46
3.4 Summary .....	50
CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY .....	51
4.1 Introduction .....	51
4.2 Research design .....	51
4.3 Settings .....	52
4.4 Participants .....	54

4.5 Instruments .....	57
4.6 Data collection .....	63
4.7 Data analysis .....	64
4.8 Summary .....	68
CHAPTER 5 ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS FROM DIFFERENT L1 BACKGROUNDS .....	69
5.1 Introduction .....	69
5.2 Perceived professional qualities of NESTs versus NNESTs .....	69
5.2.1 Linguacultural competence .....	70
5.2.2 Pedagogical capability .....	74
5.3 Expected criteria for hiring foreign English language teachers .....	79
5.3.1 L1 status and nation base .....	80
5.3.2 Academic background .....	81
5.3.3 Race .....	83
5.4 The ideal English language teacher .....	85
5.4.1 Teacher selection .....	85
5.4.2 Reasons for teacher choice .....	86
5.5 Viewpoints on workplace inequalities .....	89
5.6 Discussion and summary .....	92
CHAPTER 6 PERCEPTIONS OF DIFFERENT ENGLISH LANGUAGE VARIETIES .....	99
6.1 Introduction .....	99
6.2 Opinions on the relative status of different English language varieties .....	99
6.2.1 Inner Circle English as (more) standard English .....	100
6.2.2 Inner Circle English as (more) authentic English .....	104
6.2.3 Inner Circle English as (more) intelligible English .....	108
6.3 Whose/which English to learn/teach .....	112
6.3.1 The ideal English language variety .....	112
6.3.2 Positionality justifications .....	117
6.4 Awareness of linguistic discrimination .....	120
6.5 Discussion and summary .....	124
CHAPTER 7 VIEWPOINTS ON CULTURAL ORIENTATIONS OF ELT .....	132
7.1 Introduction .....	132
7.2 Attitudes toward Inner Circle culture in English language learning .....	132
7.2.1 Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language .....	133
7.2.2 Inner Circle culture as the reference in learning English .....	136
7.3 Whose/which culture to learn/teach .....	140
7.3.1 The learning/teaching target .....	140

7.3.2 Justifications for target selection.....	143
7.4 Perceptions of cultural threat.....	146
7.5 Discussion and summary .....	151
CHAPTER 8 OPINIONS ABOUT COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING APPROACH .....	158
8.1 Introduction .....	158
8.2 Perceived merits of CLT.....	158
8.2.1 CLT as the representative of a sophisticated education philosophy .....	159
8.2.2 CLT as an approach conducive for achieving optimal teaching effects ....	163
8.3 Attitudes toward the application of CLT to classroom instruction .....	168
8.4 Awareness of CLT as a reflection of pedagogical discrimination.....	172
8.5 Discussion and Summary .....	175
CHAPTER 9 CONCLUSION.....	183
9.1 Introduction.....	183
9.2 Major findings .....	184
9.3 Contributions .....	191
9.4 Suggestions for EFL education.....	193
9.5 Limitations and implications for future research.....	196
9.6 Final remarks .....	198
REFERENCES .....	200
Appendix 1-A Questionnaire for Students (Initial) .....	219
Appendix 1-B Questionnaire for Students (Final) .....	225
Appendix 1-C Cover Letter of the Questionnaire for Students .....	231
Appendix 2-A Questionnaire for Teachers (Initial).....	233
Appendix 2-B Questionnaire for Teachers (Final) .....	240
Appendix 2-C Cover letter of the Questionnaire for Teachers .....	247
Appendix 3 Interview Questions for Students .....	249
Appendix 4 Interview Questions for Teachers .....	251
Appendix 5 Interview Questions for Administrators.....	253



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CET-4	College English Test - Band 4
CLT	communicative language teaching
DHA	discourse-historical approach
EFL	English as a foreign language
EIL	English as an international language
ELF	English as a lingua franca
ELT	English language teaching
ESL	English as a second language
GA	General American accent
L1	first language
MGT	matched-guise test
MOE	Ministry of Education
NESTs	native English speaker teachers
NNESTs	nonnative English speaker teachers
NNS	nonnative speaker
NNSs	nonnative speakers
NS	Native speakers
NSs	native speakers
RP	Received Pronunciation
SAOFEA	State Administration of Foreign Experts Affairs
StE	Standard English
TBLT	Task-based Language Teaching
TEFL	Teaching English as a Foreign Language
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
WE	World Englishes

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Gender, discipline distribution of student participants (Questionnaire survey) .....	55
Table 4.2 Gender, academic degree and professional rank of teacher participants (Questionnaire survey) .....	55
Table 4.3 Gender, discipline distribution of student participants (Interview) .....	56
Table 4.4 Gender, academic degree and professional rank of teacher participants (Interview) .....	57
Table 4.5 Gender, academic qualification, professional rank and job position of administrator participants (Interview) .....	57
Table 5.1 Student participants' attitudes toward the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers in English .....	70
Table 5.2 Teacher participants' attitudes toward the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus NNESTs in English.....	71
Table 5.3 Independent Samples t-test of the attitudes of students and teachers toward the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus NNESTs in English.....	72
Table 5.4 Student participants' attitudes toward the pedagogical capability of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers.....	75
Table 5.5 Teacher participants' attitudes toward the pedagogical capability of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers.....	75
Table 5.6 Independent Samples t-test of the attitudes of students and teachers toward the pedagogical capability of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers.....	76
Table 5.7 Student participants' response frequencies about the ideal English language teacher .....	85
Table 5.8 Teacher participants' response frequencies about the ideal English language teacher .....	86
Table 6.1 Student participants' perceptions of whose/which English is more standard.....	100
Table 6.2 Teachers' perceptions about whose/which English is more standard .....	101
Table 6.3 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers on whose/which English is more standard .....	101
Table 6.4: Student participants' perceptions of whose/which English is more authentic .....	104
Table 6.5 Teacher participants' perceptions of whose/which English is authentic (N=68) ..	105
Table 6.6 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers on whose/which English is (more) authentic .....	105
Table 6.7 Student participants' perceptions of whose/which English is more intelligible....	108
Table 6.8 Teacher participants' perceptions of the intelligibility of NNS English .....	109
Table 6.9 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers about the intelligibility of different English varieties .....	109
Table 6.10 Students' perceptions of NS norms with regard to learning English.....	113
Table 6.11 Students' perceptions of the ideal English language variety to learn.....	113
Table 6.12 Students' perceptions of the ideal English pronunciation to acquire .....	114
Table 6.13 Teachers' perceptions of the NS language standard in teaching English.....	115
Table 6.14 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers on NS norms in learning/teaching English.....	115

Table 6.15 Teachers' perceptions of the ideal English language variety for their students to learn.....	115
Table 6.16 Teachers' perceptions of the ideal English pronunciation for their students to acquire.....	116
Table 7.1 Students' viewpoints on the cultural bedrock of the English language.....	133
Table 7.2 Teachers' viewpoints on the cultural bedrock of the English language .....	134
Table 7.3 Independent Samples t-test of the viewpoints of students and teachers on the cultural bedrock of the English language .....	134
Table 7.4 Students' viewpoints about taking NS cultural norms as the point of reference in learning English .....	137
Table 7.5 Teachers' viewpoints about taking NS cultural norms as the point of reference in learning English .....	138
Table 7.6 Independent Samples t-test of the viewpoints of the students and the teachers about adopting NS cultural norms as the point of reference in learning English.....	138
Table 7.7 Students' viewpoints about the ideal English language textbook .....	141
Table 7.8 Teachers' viewpoints about the ideal English language textbook.....	142
Table 8.1 Students' opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of education philosophy..	159
Table 8.2 Teachers' opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of education philosophy .	160
Table 8.3 Independent Samples t-test of the opinions of students and teachers about CLT in respect of education philosophy .....	160
Table 8.4 Students' opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of teaching effect .....	163
Table 8.5 Teachers' opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of teaching effect.....	164
Table 8.6 Independent Samples t-test of the opinions of students and teachers about CLT in respect of teaching effect.....	165
Table 8.7 Students' opinions about the ideal EFL teaching approach.....	168
Table 8.8 Teachers' opinions about the ideal EFL teaching approach.....	169

# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1 An emerging controversial situation

In the realm of English language teaching (henceforth ELT), there has been a pervasive ideology or an established belief in support of native English speaker teachers (henceforth NESTs), which Holliday (2005, 2006) termed as Native-speakerism. To be specific, NESTs are claimed to be the best teachers based on the conception that they “represent a ‘Western culture’ from which springs the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology” (Holliday, 2005, p. 6). Although this term was coined by Holliday to describe the idealization of NESTs in ELT, it also involves the worship of native speaker (henceforth NS) English and teaching approaches and methods that emanate from the English speaking West or the Kachruvian Inner Circle countries (Kachru, 1985). In addition, the pro-nativeness ethos manifests itself in the idolization of “... textbooks published by Western publishing houses, research agenda set by Center-based scholars, professional journals edited and published from Center countries [and many other Inner Circle artifacts]” (Kumaravadivelu, 2012, p. 15). It seems that nativeness serves as the norm anywhere in ELT. As such, the term, Native-speakerism, need transcend the Hollidayian definition in semantic range to refer to the pro-nativeness ideology in every dimension of ELT. A comparatively comprehensive study on Native-speakerism should therefore expand the scope of many previous studies concentrating on the NESTs versus nonnative English speaker teachers (henceforth NNESTs) dichotomy to incorporate other dichotomous issues, particularly those pertaining to English language standard, cultural orientation and teaching approach, as they, alongside the issue regarding teachers, constitute four major concerns of everyday ELT practice.

Observed from the sociocultural and historical-political perspective, Native-speakerism can be viewed as a chauvinistic ideology originated from Inner Circle countries (e.g., Holliday, 2005, 2006; Kachru, 2009; Kubota & Lin, 2009). Nevertheless, the political, economic and cultural hegemony of these countries obscures the chauvinistic essence of this ideology, which is then widely accepted by ELT stakeholders of traditional nonnative English speaking countries (Holliday, 2005, 2006) or Outer and Expanding

Circle countries (Kachru, 1985). The consent or acquiescence to this ideology is also facilitated by the modernistic empirical-cum-positivistic research paradigm in applied linguistic and ELT (Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009). As a corollary, Native-speakerism develops into a “domesticated, think-as-usual professional routine” (Holliday, 2015, p. 20) or a naturalized “bedrock of transnational ELT” (Leung, 2005, p. 128), with its culturist, ethnocentric and (neo)racist essence taken for granted as well as the attendant discriminatory and self-discriminatory ELT practices justified unprofessionally. For instance, NESTs as a rule are prioritized over NNESTs in teacher hiring practices and enjoy more or greater respects at workplaces (e.g., Doan, 2016; Govardhan, Nayar, & Sheorey, 1999). In the meantime, Inner Circle English <sup>[1]</sup>, particularly Anglo-American English, tends to be upheld as the default pedagogical model and learning target, despite the current glocalization of the English language (e.g., Bolton, 2008; Kachru, 1992a, 1992b; Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Matsuda, 2006). Moreover, most ELT curriculum materials are edited in reference to Inner Circle culture, leaving Outer and Expanding Circle cultures in the margin (e.g., Baker, 2009; Byram, 1988; McKay, 2000, 2009). In addition, teaching approaches and/or methods stemming from Inner Circle countries are usually promoted as the most advanced in global ELT, with scant, if any, attention attached to their compatibility with the educational cultures of Outer and Expanding Circle countries (e.g., Bax, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2006, 2008; Phan, 2008, 2014). This is particularly true of the communicative language teaching approach (henceforth CLT), which, as an umbrella term, refers to the communication-oriented, task-based and learner-centered teaching approach (e.g., Littlewood, 2014). All of these strands of ELT practices, in tandem with their loaded pro-nativeness ideology, contribute to denying the linguistic, cultural and epistemic heritages of Outer and Expanding Circle countries, legitimizing conversely the “epistemological racism” (Kubota, 2002) of the English speaking West.

Pervasive as Native-speakerism is in global ELT, discursive and ideological struggles against it have also arisen. They are derived from three major interweaved sources. The first one consists in the critical studies related to ELT, particularly those conducted

---

<sup>[1]</sup> This study adopts the terminologies, such as Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle English, culture and teaching methodology, Centre or Periphery etc. As with many researchers (e.g., Phan, 2008; Saraceni, 2015), I am aware of the limitations of these terms. For instance, there is no unified English language and monolithic culture across Inner Circle countries, no country adopts a single teaching methodology, and not all NESTs or NNESTs are the same. In this study, these terms are adopted as conceptual tools.

since the early 1990s, which explore discrimination or inequality in this educational area from the perspective of geo- and cultural-politics. For instance, Phillipson's linguistic imperialism thesis exposes the imperialist nature of the "native speaker (NS) fallacy" <sup>[2]</sup> (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185), a predominant belief in ELT that native English speakers are best English language teachers. Pennycook's treatise on the English language and the discourse of colonialism illuminates the relics of colonialist ideology in current ELT theories and practices (Pennycook, 1998). Kumaravadivelu's post-method argument challenges the epistemic hegemony of Inner Circle teaching methodology (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a).

The second source can be traced to the scholarship on the glocalization of the English language and its advocate for re-conceptualizing the conventional Native-speakerist ELT paradigm (e.g., Alsagoff et al., 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2007b, 2009; Seargeant, 2012). These studies explore the dynamics of the English language in the current multilingual and multicultural world, debunking the long-standing myth about its ownership (e.g., Pinner, 2014; Widdowson, 1998a) and advocating a liberal, democratic and pluralistic perspective on variegated and varying English language varieties (e.g., Dewey, 2015; Rajagopalan, 2004; Saraceni, 2009, 2010; Sharifian, 2009, 2013). Furthermore, they articulate a call for the divorce from the traditional pro-nativeness ELT epistemology (e.g., Alptekin, 2002; Kumaravadivelu, 2012, 2016).

The third source derives from the institutional and scholarly efforts of NNESTs Movement launched in the late 1990s (e.g., Braine, 2005; Canagarajah, 1999a; Kamhi-Stein, 2004, 2016; Liu, 1999). This strand of challenges explored the ideological essence of the NS construct (e.g., Canagarajah, 2005; Davies, 1991, 2003). It declares that the construct is nothing but "a figment of linguist's imagination" (Paikeday, 1985, p. 12, as cited in Moussu & Llurda, 2008, p. 315) or at most a myth "created by those who would like to accept the distinction between native speakers and nonnative speakers" (Kramsch, 1997, p. 363). Essentially, it defies the "unprofessional favoritism" (Medgyes, 2001) for NESTs, particularly Anglo-American Caucasian teachers and criticizes the related discriminatory practices against NNESTs at job markets (e.g.,

---

<sup>[2]</sup> As with Phillipson (1992), the term, native speaker (NS), in this thesis stands for native English speaker. Sometimes it refers to its surface meaning, i.e., native speaker of any language. Which meaning it conveys depends on the actual context where it is used.

Mahboob et al., 2004; Selvi, 2010, 2011) and in workplaces (e.g., Kubota & Lin, 2006; Methitham, 2012).

To date, the ideological and discursive struggles against Native-speakerism in ELT have lasted for about a quarter of a century. During this period, a plethora of empirical studies have been conducted to investigate the attitudes of ELT stakeholders – students, teachers and/or ELT program administrators – toward English language teachers from different first language (henceforth L1) backgrounds, variegated and varying English language varieties, disparate cultural orientations of ELT, and teaching approaches rooted in diverse cultural contexts. Indicated by most of the studies centered on the NESTs versus NNESTs dichotomy, NESTs enjoyed strong support among the vast majority of the participants (e.g., Butler, 2007; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002). However, many participants in some other studies expressed positive attitudes toward both NESTs and NNESTs (e.g., Moussu, 2002, 2006b, 2010a). As regards different English language varieties, Inner Circle English was generally upheld as Standard English (henceforth StE) and thereby the pedagogical norm or learning target, though a certain number of teachers and students displayed an awareness of the current glocalization of the English language (e.g., Chan, 2017). Regarding cultural orientations of ELT, many studies indicate that teaching and learning materials edited in accordance with Inner Circle culture, particularly Anglo-American culture, were deemed normative (e.g., Önalán, 2005; Rafieyan, et al., 2013) whereas others reveal that cultures of Outer and Expanding Circle countries were also expected to be included (e.g., Bayyurt, 2006). In terms of teaching approaches, CLT was found to be upheld in general as being superb or superior to traditional teacher-centered teaching approach (e.g., Karim, 2004; Savignon & Wang, 2003). Nevertheless, most of the participants in an unneglectable proportion of those studies expressed reservations about the application of CLT to classroom teaching in Outer and Expanding Circle countries, contending that it does not dovetail with the educational conventions of these countries (e.g., Chowdhury & Phan, 2008; Rahimi & Naderi, 2014).

Observed from the findings of these studies, it is evident that the ideological and discursive struggles against Native-speakerism have not fully attained their pursued objectives, i.e., disinventing Native-speakerism and constructing a democratic, ethic and equitable ELT profession, as the pro-nativeness mentality still lingers among many

participants, albeit the existence of a critical stance among others. As the participants of those studies are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice, their attitudes represent to a great degree the persistence of Native-speakerism in ELT.

However, these studies as an entirety seem to have some methodological limitations that prevent them from capturing a panorama of the ideological effects of Native-speakerism on ELT stakeholders (see details in Section 2.2.2). Firstly, most of the studies are descriptive in design, with insufficient attention attached to the sociocultural and historical-political factors within global ELT and their respective research contexts. Secondly, each of the studies concentrates on one or two aspects of ELT and none incorporates as a research focus simultaneously the four crucial respects of everyday ELT practice to do with English language teacher, English language standard, cultural orientation and teaching approach. Thirdly, each of them merely takes one or two categories of ELT stakeholders as research subjects. It is therefore inevitable that each of these studies tends to expose part of the ideological effects of Native-speakerism.

As part of the global ELT, English as a foreign language (henceforth EFL) education in mainland China (hereafter China) followed the Native-speakerist paradigm in history (e.g., Gong, 2009; Guo & Beckett, 2007; Wang & Hill, 2011). In view of the current ideological and discursive struggles against Native-speakerism, a question has arisen, namely, whether this chauvinistic ideology continues to serve as the “regime of truth” (Foucault, 1984) in China’s EFL education. Regretfully, relevant studies, particularly those exploring the mentality of Chinese ELT stakeholders are comparatively small in quantity (e.g., Wang, 2013). Of those available, most are centered on investigating the views of Chinese EFL teachers and students on different English language varieties (e.g., He, 2015; Hu, 2004, 2005; Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002). Only a small number are concerned with Native-speakerism in other aspects of ELT and this seems particularly true of the studies on the NESTs versus NNESTs issue (e.g., He & Miller, 2011; Jin, 2005). As such, it would be of necessity to conduct studies, particularly large-scale ones within the context of ELT in China, focusing on the related the attitudes of different categories of Chinese ELT stakeholders toward different aspects of ELT. Such studies are also much of value in view of the current immense scale of EFL education in China – 400 million English learners and users (Wei & Su, 2012) – and the attendant potential contributions to the development of the English language and global ELT. Given the



dynamics of discourse, ideology and power as well as the historicity of Native-speakerism, it is suggested that Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA), particularly its discourse-historical approach (henceforth DHA) (e.g., Reisigl & Wodak, 2009) be adopted as a theoretical and methodological guideline.

## **1.2 Research objectives**

The overarching objective of this study is to find out whether – if so, to what extent – EFL education in China is still affected by Native-speakerism by exploring the related viewpoints of three groups of Chinese ELT stakeholders, i.e., students, teachers and EFL program administrators (hereafter, administrators). Guided by this grand goal, this study attempts to

- (1) discover the mentality in relation to Native-speakerism among these three categories of ELT stakeholders, and
- (2) locate inter-group (in)congruities in mentality among these stakeholder groups.

The attainment of this goal is expected to provide suggestions for ELT stakeholders to adjust their practices for the construction of a (more) equitable and ethical ELT world.

## **1.3 Research questions**

In accordance with this objective, five research questions are proposed, with a focus on the representation of Native-speakerism in the perceptions of students, teachers and administrators on four aspects of ELT as well as inter-group (dis)similarities. They include:

- (1) What attitudes toward English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds are held by the three stakeholder groups?
- (2) How do they perceive different English language varieties?
- (3) What are their viewpoints on cultural orientations of ELT?
- (4) In what ways do they view the approach of CLT?
- (5) Are there any inter-group (dis)similarities in opinion on each of these four aspects of ELT?

## **1.4 EFL education in China**

Since Native-speakerism is context-specific (Holliday, 2005, p. 8; Houghton & Rivers, 2013, p. 5), this section is to outline EFL education in China along a historical line in order to provide a historical-present context for this study. Drawing on the sociocultural and historical-political factors in China as well as their interactions with the global politics, EFL education in China can be viewed from three historical phases. It is noted that ELT for Chinese English major students is left off, as they are small in number in comparison with non-English-major students in China (see Wang 2016; Zhong & Sun, 2014).

### **1.4.1 Prior to 1949**

The history of EFL education in China can be traced back to the period from 1759 to 1842, when the Sino-European commercial exchanges were confined to Guangzhou (Bolton, 2002, 2008), a city in South China close to Hong Kong. For business reasons, ‘pidgin English’ started to be taught on a small scale by some Chinese individuals whereas Standard English was offered by a few Christian mission schools in this region. However, most Chinese, particularly those in upper social positions, refused to learn English, as they upheld China as the center of the world, civilized and advanced whilst disparaging foreigners as barbarians “who had little to offer, either culturally or materially” (Evans, 2006, p. 45).

After the defeat in the Second Anglo-Chinese War (1860), termed in China as the Second Opium War, learning foreign languages started to be accepted by the upper class in China. However, a superior status was still accorded to the Chinese language and its concomitant culture. At the outset of the “Self-strengthening Movement” initiated by the central government of Manchu Empire or Qing Dynasty, Tongwen Guan, a language school affiliated to the Department of Foreign Affairs, was founded in Beijing in 1862. The overarching principle governing the foreign language education programs was “Chinese Learning for fundamentals, Western Learning for practice”, a formula that entails “learning and using English [and other Western languages] for science and technology, while still retaining a strong feeling of Chinese identity” (Jin & Cortazzi, 2002, p. 54). Nevertheless, this nationalist ethos about the superiority of

Chinese language and culture was almost smattered by China's defeat in the First Sino-Japanese War (1894), after which, the Westernization Movement in China gained more momentum, resulting in further promotion of ELT. For instance, the 1903 national syllabus stipulated Chinese, mathematics and foreign languages as three core courses at the modern state-run schools established after 1894 (e.g., Bolton, 2002; Chen, 2011).

When the Republic of China was established, it was due to the purpose of nation building that the central government advocated learning the political and economic system as well as the social culture of the West, particularly those of the United States. This in turn further spurred EFL education in this young republic. The national curriculum syllabus for secondary schools issued in 1922 provided that the number of English language class hours at senior high schools be the same as that for Chinese course (Chen, 2011, p. 80). At many missionary-run and some state-run schools, a new teaching method, "direct method", was adopted to replace the "Grammar-Translation method" (Chen, 2011, p. 125). At most state-run schools and universities, Grammar-Translation method was still followed, as it agrees with the traditional language-teaching mode in China in that, for example, both emphasize detailed textual analysis. Also accountable for adopting this method was the limited oral English proficiency of most Chinese EFL teachers (Woolsey, 1992, as cited in Rao, 2013, p. 35).

As regards ELT in China prior to 1949, two obvious ideological features can be observed. One is that the general attitude of Chinese society toward the English language and its related culture shifted from despising rejection to wide acceptance. The other lies in that instrumentalism or pragmatism developed into the mainstream motivation for learning English, particularly on the part of the state. As a corollary, the belief in English as a language of progress and the gatekeeper to modernization (Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992) came to be firmly established in this country. English was then deemed "as a tool similar to mathematics or physics and without any potential cultural implications" (Pan, 2015, p. 66).

#### 1.4.2 From 1949 to 1999

English, as a "barometer of modernization" (Ross, 1992), had experienced rises and falls in China since 1949 when the People's Republic of China was founded (Cortazzi

& Jin, 1996, p. 64). In the 1950s, due to the conflicts in political ideology between China and the English speaking West as well as China's intimate relations with the former Soviet Russia, English was switched to Russian as the major foreign language in China (e.g., Rao, 2013). The political break with Soviet Russia in the late 1950s and the establishment of China's diplomatic relations with many third-world countries helped to restore the *priori* status of English in China (e.g., Chang, 2006). However, the revival of ELT did not last long before it was almost suspended throughout the country due to the so-called "Cultural Revolution" from 1966 to 1976.

The end of the political chaos and the adoption of the Open and Reform policy by the central government of China led to a new renaissance of ELT in China. In 1978, the foreign language education conference held by the Chinese Ministry of Education (MOE) decided to restore English as a compulsory course at secondary and tertiary education sectors. English was then stipulated as a required subject in the university entrance examination (Boyle, 2000). In 1982, the MOE further consolidated the status of English as a *priori* foreign language in secondary schools and institutions of higher learning by issuing national English syllabi (see Chang, 2006). All these measures taken by the MOE led to an English learning fervor in China.

Alongside the popularity of the English language, its gatekeeping role was constantly reinforced at different walks of life in China. According to He (2001, as cited in Cheng, 2008), "English skills are tested for all those seeking promotion in governmental, educational, scientific research, medical, financial, business and other government-supported institutions" (p. 17). In order to meet the pragmatic demand for English, many cram or night schools were set up in the 1980s and 1990s. Teaching English started to emerge as a profitable business, particularly in urban areas (Nunan, 2003, p. 595). For instance, one of the most popular out-of-school English programs was "Crazy English", founded by Yang Li, who advocated the instrumental or pragmatic end of learning English in many of his promotion lectures. EFL education at state-run schools was also entrenched in an instrumental mentality as if English were an ideologically neutral instrument. This ideology is expressed explicitly in different national English syllabi. For example,

Foreign language is an important tool for learning cultural and scientific knowledge; for acquiring information in different fields from around the world; and for developing international communication” (1986 National English syllabus for secondary education; translated by Adamson & Morris, 1997, p. 16).

In addition to the promotion of the English language, the two decades following the adoption of Open and Reform policy issued by Chinese government in 1978 witnessed changes or reformations in EFL education. New teaching approaches were introduced from Inner Circle countries, such as CLT in the mid of 1980s and its updated version, Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Littlewood, 2014, p. 350) in early 1990s (e.g., Rao, 2013). Textbooks were in turn required to present ‘authentic’ English in order to help students to develop communicative competence in real life situations. All these reforms have contributed to reproducing the hegemony of Inner Circle teaching methodology, reinforcing in turn the pro-nativeness ethos in China’s EFL education.

Nevertheless, the English fever started to be challenged by the ‘English as threat’ ethos in China in the second half of the 1990s (e.g., Pan, 2015; Pan & Seargeant, 2012). It can be regarded as a response to the boom of EFL education and the asserted consequent degradation of Chinese students’ literacy in their mother tongue and national culture (e.g., Zhou, 2007). However, this standpoint seems insignificant when compared to the instrumentalist ideology prevalent in China, resulting in an unabated momentum for the further expansion of EFL education in China and promotion of Inner Circle culture in this educational realm.

#### 1.4.3 After 2000

Ever since 2000, China has been engaged in ever-increasing international exchanges in politics, commerce, science, technology and culture, such as joining the World Trade Organization in 2001, holding the Olympic Games in 2008 and the Shanghai World Expo in 2010. Influenced by these exchanges, EFL education in China has experienced an unprecedented expansion, changing itself completely from an elite business in the past into a truly grass-root one.

Currently, English has become a compulsory course for students from the third grade on at primary schools. In some economically developed regions, the English-medium instruction for non-language subjects is operated at primary and secondary schools (Hu,

2009, p. 47). Even some kindergartens in those affluent areas offer English language programs to meet the demand of many parents who expect their children to acquire this linguistic capital as early as possible. In addition, English has been raised to a new height at institutes of higher learning. For example, there is a regulation at most state-run universities that non-English-major undergraduates must attend College English (henceforth CE) program and pass College English Test - Band 4 (CET-4)<sup>[3]</sup>, before they are entitled to apply for the Bachelor's degree. For postgraduate students, English is also stipulated as a compulsory course. All of these practices at schools of different educational levels have reinforced the superior status of the English language in China.

Alongside the increasing popularity of the English language, the Chinese MOE has constantly renewed its national English curriculum syllabi to regulate ELT practices. As regards those syllabi, there are three outstanding characteristics. Firstly, the syllabi accentuate the 'four skills' or the four icons in ELT (see Holliday, 2005, p. 42), i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing, and set up, in reference to NS norms, exact criteria on linguistic competence in these four areas that learners are expected to achieve. For example, *College English Course Requirement* (2007) declares that "the objective of College English education is to help students to develop a comprehensive competence in using English, particularly listening and speaking abilities, so that students can communicate effectively in English in their future study, work and social interactions" (MOE, 2007, p. 2, my translation). With regard to the most successful learners, the syllabus provides that they should "be able to understand TV programs of English speaking countries, grasp main ideas and catch the gist, and understand personnel from English speaking countries when they speak at norm speed" (MOE, 2007, p. 7, my translation). In *English Curriculum Standard at Compulsory Education Stage* (2011), linguistic competence in English is also accorded an accurate description. In terms of reading, the most successful learners are anticipated to "be able to read unabridged English novels" (MOE, 2011, p. 11, my translation).

Secondly, these syllabi advocates cultivating students' intercultural competence. For

---

<sup>[3]</sup> College English (CE) is a program or course offered exclusively to non-English-major undergraduate students in China. CET-4 is a national standardized English language examination for those students. As a nationwide test since 1987, it is aimed at improving the quality of College English education. However, the results of this test have been widely used in China as a gate-keeper for those students in both academic and vocational fields.

instance, *English Curriculum Standard at Compulsory Education Stage* (2011) states that students should develop an intercultural awareness and the ability to conduct intercultural communications by experiencing different cultures, in addition to improving their linguistic competence in English. The same perspective is also stated in *College English Teaching Guideline* (MOE, 2017). The emphasis on cultivating students' intercultural competence can be viewed as a response of China's aspiration to participate fully in the current globalization. It also resonates with the sociopolitical prevalent in China that English can serve as a media to introduce China or transmit Chinese culture to the world (see Wen, 2012a), a mission propagated by the national government based on the self-confidence out of China's escalating economic status in the current world (e.g., Pan, 2015). Despite this seemingly multicultural and nationalist objective, Chinese culture continues to be undervalued in China's ELT, with the acquisition of Inner Circle culture still upheld as the objective. As stipulated in the 2011 English curriculum standard for compulsory education, the culture to teach/learn refers to "the target culture countries' history and geography, local people's features, natural conditions and social customs, living habits, behavior norms, arts and literature as well as values and ideology" (MOE, 2011, p. 23, as cited in Gong & Holliday, 2013, p. 45). This cultural orientation is also represented in much ELT research. For example, 95% of the journal articles published in China from 2005 to 2010 upheld the cultivation of students' competence in intercultural communication merely as introducing to them the culture of Inner Circle countries (Gong, 2011, as cited in Gong & Holliday, 2013).

Thirdly, these syllabi specify the adoption of the pedagogical approaches or teaching methods that emanate from Inner Circle countries. For instance, *English Curriculum Standard at Compulsory Education Stage* (2001, 2011) provides the adoption of CLT and its independent, individualized and learner-centered teaching and learning strategies, albeit their limited success in application. This is also true of the syllabi for CE education. As stated in *College English Course Requirement* (2007),

Colleges and universities should make full use of the modern information technology and adopt a computer- and classroom-based English teaching model in order to improve the in-class teaching mode dominated solely by the teacher-centered instruction. The new model should rely on modern information technology, particularly the support of Web technique, to make English teaching and learning free from temporal and spatial constraints and develop along the line of individualized and independent study (MOE, 2007, p. 5, my translation).

In comparison, *College English Teaching Guideline* (2017) stipulates more exactly that classroom instruction of CE should adopt task-based, project-based, collaborative or exploratory approaches in order to make students become the center of learning and enhance their communicative competence in English.

Observed from these national syllabi, it is obvious that the objectives of EFL education in respect of linguistic competence, intercultural competence and teaching approach are still entrenched in the conventional pro-nativeness ideology. This ideology is also represented in both the policies and the actual practices concerning the employment of foreign English language teachers. According to the official document, *Work Permit Service Guidance for Foreign Experts to Work in China*, issued by the Chinese State Administration of Foreign Experts Affairs (SAOFEA) on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015, it is provided that

Language teachers should hold a Bachelor's degree and have two-year language education experiences, and in principle, they should come from native English speaking countries. Applicants from nonnative English speaking countries should hold a Bachelor's degree or above obtained from English as a native language countries (SAOFEA, 2015, p. 21, my translation).

This statement makes it explicit that priority should be given to NSs. In fact, the NS status had served as the priori criterion in hiring practices in China before the issuance of this official document. This can be exemplified by a job advertisement for English language teaching positions posted online by Ocean University of China, a prestigious university in China, on December 16th, 2013.

Applicants must meet the following requirements: 1) Native speaker, 2) Bachelor's degree or above, preferably master's degree or above in a relevant field, 3) Over 2 years teaching experience, and 4) Teaching Certificate (TESOL, TEFL or others) <sup>[4]</sup>. (<http://web.ouc.edu.cn/rsc/4c/93/c923a19603/page.htm>)

Since linguistic discrimination often accompanies racial or ethnical prejudice (e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas, 2001; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007), it is inevitable that the pro-nativeness criterion engenders racial discrimination in actual hiring practices (e.g., Guo, 2009; Ruecker, 2011; Ruecker & Ives, 2015; Shuck, 2006). For example, White applicants from European countries outside the British Isles are more likely to secure a

---

<sup>[4]</sup> TESOL, in this thesis, is the abbreviation of “teaching English to speakers of other languages”; TEFL stands for “teaching English as a foreign language”.



job in China if they can speak English with a minimum of non-English accent, though the ideal applicants are expected to come from Inner Circle countries (e.g., Braine, 2010; Jeon & Lee, 2006, p. 54). By contrast, native English speakers (henceforth NSs) with a Chinese pedigree are often rejected with the excuse that students prefer White NESTs (e.g., Hsu, 2005; Shao, 2005).

In this section, the rise and fall of EFL education in China, in tandem with its ideological changes, is delineated along a historical line. Four major characteristics are observable. The first is that ELT in China has been entrenched in instrumental rationality on the part of the state and individuals. The second is the unprecedented expansion of ELT promoted by the government since the adoption of the Open and Reform policy by Chinese government in 1978. The third is the prominence of a pro-nativeness ideology in ELT policies or national English curriculum syllabi issued by the Chinese MOE, particularly those promulgated since 2000. The last one refers to the fluctuating ideological status of Chinese culture vis-à-vis Inner Circle culture throughout the history of EFL education in China. All of these contextual factors, in tandem with the ideological and discursive struggles against Native-speakerism on the international stage, constitute the sociocultural and historical-political context for this study.

## **1.5 Structure of the thesis**

The thesis consists of nine chapters. Chapter 1 first introduces research background in reference to the chauvinistic essence and ideological effects of Native-speakerism, the current ideological and discursive struggles thereof, and the findings of relevant empirical studies. Then it reports on research objectives and the attendant research questions before outlining the macro context of EFL education in China along a historical line. The structure of the thesis is presented at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 2 reviews two groups of empirical studies on Native-speakerism. One includes a plethora of studies on the viewpoints of ELT stakeholders on this chauvinistic ideology in four respects of ELT. Precisely, the studies are about how the stakeholders perceive English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds, variegated and varying English language varieties, different cultural orientations of ELT and the

communicative language teaching approach. The other consists of a few critical studies that probed into Native-speakerism from CDA approach. The review of these two groups of literature helps to discern their gaps or limitations, therefore deciding on the theoretical framework and research methodology for this study.

Chapter 3 illustrates the theoretical framework of this study. It outlines the theoretical lens of CDA and the methodological framework of its sub-branch DHA. Meanwhile, it justifies why CDA, particularly DHA is able to supply an appropriate road map for this study. Chapter 4 describes the broad research design as well as the concrete research constituents, including research setting, participants and instruments. Also reported are the process of data collection and the strategic plan for analyzing data.

Chapters 5 to 8 present and discuss research findings based on the analysis of the data, therefore providing answers to the four research questions designed to investigate the attitudinal tendency among the three stakeholder groups regarding Native-speakerism. Chapter 5 presents the findings about the attitudes of those stakeholders toward English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds. It analyzes their viewpoints on the professional competence of NESTs vis-à-vis NNESTs, the criteria to be followed in hiring foreign English language teachers and the ideal English language teachers with whom to learn English as well as their awareness of the inequality between NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers in workplaces. Chapter 6 focuses on their perceptions of different English language varieties. It explores their opinions about the relative status of those varieties and the ideal English language variety they expected to acquire as well as their consciousness of the linguistic inequality in ELT generated by the promotion of Inner Circle English. Chapter 7 probes into their viewpoints on the cultural orientations of ELT. It dissects how they perceive the relationship between Inner Circle culture and ELT as well as on whose/which culture they upheld as the learning ideal. It also analyzes their awareness of the discrimination against Chinese culture brought about by the strong emphasis on Inner Circle culture in China's EFL education. Chapter 8 reports on their views about the merits of CLT vis-à-vis the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China and the application of CLT to classroom instruction. At the same time, it explores their understandings of whether the promotion of CLT brings about discrimination against the conventional education culture of China. It is noted that the findings presented in each chapter are discussed in reference to the sociocultural and

historical-political context surrounding EFL education in China.

Chapter 9 draws a conclusion of the study. It first revisits research background, focus, theoretical approach and methodology, and then summarizes research findings and presents the insights gained through reflections on those results. In the meantime, it discusses the contributions of this study and its implications for adjusting current ELT practices in China to resist Native-speakerism. Following that, it illuminates its limitations and the implications for future studies, before concluding this chapter with a call for continuing to fight Native-speakerism in ELT.

## **Chapter 2 Attitudinal and Critical Studies on Native-speakerism**

### **2.1 Introduction**

Chapter 1 outlines the ideological essence and effects of Native-speakerism, the current discursive struggles against it in global ELT as well as the sociocultural and historical-political situation of EFL education in China, all of which constitute the macro context of this study and bring forth research objectives and questions. This chapter reviews relevant previous empirical studies on the effects of this ideology on ELT in order to find out their limitations or gaps and then decide on an appropriate theoretical and methodological framework for the present research. As noted earlier (see Sections 1.1 and 1.2), Native-speakerism has a historical validity China's ELT and this study is intended to find out whether – if so, to what extent – EFL education in China is still affected by this chauvinistic ideology by investigating the related viewpoints of Chinese EFL stakeholders – students, teachers and administrators – on four interweaved aspects of ELT. Literature commensurate with this research parameter comprises studies that investigate the attitudes of ELT stakeholders toward the issues in relation to Native-speakerism and those exploring this chauvinistic ideology from a critical lens. By “critical”, it refers in this chapter to the studies that adopt CDA as a theoretical approach in exploring Native-speakerism. It is noted that the division of the studies into these two categories is out of the purpose of organization and presentation and does not intend to deny the possibility of conducting a critical study on this chauvinistic ideology by concentrating on the attitudes of ELT stakeholders.

Four sections are included in this chapter. Following the general introduction (Section 2.1), Section 2.2 analyzes the studies that investigate the attitudes of three groups of ELT stakeholders – teachers, students and administrators – toward different English language teachers judged primarily by their L1 identities, diverse English language varieties, multiple cultural orientations of ELT curricula and Inner Circle CLT. Section 2.3 dissects a small number of studies on Native-speakerism conducted from the perspective of CDA. The chapter concludes in Section 2.4 with a summary of the major content presented in the preceding sections.

## 2.2 Attitudinal studies

As noted earlier (see Section 1.1), a plethora of empirical studies have been conducted in different sociocultural and historical-political contexts to investigate the attitudes of ELT stakeholders toward Native-speakerism in the past two decades or so. In terms of research content, they tend to focus on the stakeholders' perceptions of this chauvinistic ideology in the four dimensions of ELT to do with English language teachers (see Braine, 2004, 2010; Selvi, 2014), English language varieties (see Llurda, 2009), cultural bases of ELT curricular materials (see Young & Sachdev, 2011), and CLT (see Littlewood, 2014). As regards research design, they fall into three categories, i.e., direct approach utilizing questionnaire and/or interview, indirect approach adopting matched-guise test (MGT) <sup>[5]</sup>, and mix-method approaches. This section first reviews these attitudinal studies and then make a holistic assessment of their limitations.

### 2.2.1 Studies on Native-speakerism in four respects of ELT

#### Perspectives on the NESTs versus NNESTs issue

Studies on the perceptions of ELT stakeholders regarding NESTs versus NNESTs issue were mainly stimulated by the NEST Movement (see Braine, 2004, 2010; Mahboob, 2010; Rudolph et al., 2015; Selvi, 2014). Of them, most were conducted with students and teachers. By contrast, studies with ELT program administrators are small in number.

The studies with students were conducted in different ELT contexts, focusing on their viewpoints on the professional competence of NESTs vis-a-vis NNESTs and the ideal English language teacher with whom they expect to learn English. Within Inner Circle countries, Moussu (2002) is perhaps one of the first researchers who have explored this issue. She adopted a direct approach, collecting data through questionnaire surveys and interviews from 84 English as a second language (henceforth ESL) students from 21 countries at a US university, though four teachers working at the ESL program of the

---

<sup>[5]</sup> MGT refers to one of the research instruments adopted in sociolinguistic and language education studies to investigate the language attitude of an individual or a group. Usually, it uses "recorded voices of people speaking first in one dialect or language and then in another; that is, in two "guises".... The recordings are played to listeners who do not know that the two samples of speech are from the same person and who judge the two guises of the same speaker as though they were judging two separate speakers" (Richards et al., 1989, p. 171, as cited in Gaies & Beebe, 1991, p. 157).

university were included as a complement. Data analysis indicates that in contrast to the “NS fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185), the belief that native English speakers are best English language teachers, NNESTs in this study were rated positively, even in respect of English language competence. To be specific, 68% of the students stated that they could learn English from both NESTs and NNESTs, and 84% considered it worthwhile to have English learning experiences with NNESTs. Similar positive attitudes toward NNESTs have been discovered in other studies (e.g., Adolphs, 2005; Beckett & Stiefvater, 2009; Mahboob, 2003; Moussu, 2006a, 2010a). In the meantime, different from the conventional belief that NNESTs are less competent in the English language, particularly in pronunciation than their native counterparts, most of the student participants in these studies claimed that NS pronunciation or accent is not directly related to pedagogical professionalism. This finding is corroborative of the viewpoint of Astor (2000) that a qualified English language teacher must possess the knowledge of three fields – pedagogy, methodology and applied linguistics – and being a NS alone cannot make a person develop into a professionally competent English language teacher automatically (e.g., Phillipson, 1992; Rampton, 1990; Selvi, 2010). By contrast, Kelch and Santana-Williamson (2002) arrived at a different finding, namely, most of their student participants expressed more preferences for NESTs, who were claimed to possess superior competence in English. It is noteworthy that the results of the MGT used in this study indicate that most of the participants were found unable to differentiate NS and nonnative speaker (henceforth, NNS) accents highly accurately. This special finding seems to instantiate that the NS status is not an objective or empirically verifiable reality but a socially constructed myth (e.g., Aneja, 2016; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001; Davies, 1991, 2003; Kramsch, 1997; Phillipson, 1992), particularly “created by those who would like to accept the distinction between native speakers and nonnative speakers” (Kramsch, 1997, p. 363).

In Outer and Expanding Circle countries, studies similar in methodology to the aforementioned ones were conducted, with mixed findings as well (e.g., Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Cheung, 2002; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002; Ma, 2012). NESTs tended to be appreciated for their competence in English and knowledge of Inner Circle culture. Positive comments of high frequency are that NESTs have “true pronunciation” (Mahboob, 2004, p. 141) and their English is “more standard” (Luk & Lin, 2006, p. 23). Notwithstanding the linguistic weakness claimed, NNESTs were seen to possess more

pedagogical strength, namely they possess the knowledge of the local culture, understand students' learning difficulties and can therefore create a supportive classroom milieu (e.g., Cheung & Braine, 2007). These findings are corroborative of the purports of Medgyes (1994) on the pedagogical strength of NNESTs. According to him, NNESTs have six distinguished pedagogical merits. Namely, they are able to 1) serve as the imitable model of a successful English learner, 2) teach learning strategies more effectively, 3) anticipate learning difficulty, 4) provide learners with more meta-linguistic knowledge about the English language, 5) understand learners' needs and problems, and 6) utilize their L1 if teaching English in their home countries. However, some other studies (e.g., Sung, 2014) reveals that the NNESTs were generally perceived by students to follow a monotonous teaching style in contrast to the pedagogical flexibility of NESTs.

As regards the opinions of students on the ideal teacher from whom to learn English, studies reveal complicated findings. For instance, most of the student participants expressed preferences for NESTs in many studies (e.g., Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Butler, 2007) whereas indicating support for NNESTs in others (e.g., Cheung, 2002). Studies conducted more recently, however, suggest that most of the students preferred a team teaching model of these two types of teachers (e.g., Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2010; Ma, 2012). This finding is corroborated by the study of He and Miller (2011), one of the few studies in this regard that concentrate on EFL education in China. In this study, 79% of the non-English-major student participants (777) expressed an explicit preference for the co-teaching mode of NESTs and NNESTs, claiming that this mode can help them to gain benefits simultaneously from both types of teachers. By contrast, only 36 % (357) and 18.9% (186) expected to be taught merely by NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers respectively.

Despite the above-stated complicated attitudes toward the NESTs versus NNESTs issue, it seems that the student participants as a whole hold judgmental attitudes regarding the professional competence of these two categories of teachers as well as the issue about the ideal teachers from whom to learn English. However, most of the studies on the self-perception of NNESTs display a rather different picture. Although some studies suggest positive self-evaluations of NNESTs in respect of pedagogical strength (e.g., Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002), English pronunciation and communication skill (e.g.,

Kamhi-Stein et al., 2004) or multicultural identity (e.g., Park, 2012), many others indicate that the majority of the NNESTs felt inferior to NESTs linguistically (e.g., Butler, 2007; Doğançay-Aktuna, 2008; Llorca & Huguet, 2003; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). For instance, in the study of Tang (1997), 92% of the teacher participants were found holding the belief that NESTs are better in pronunciation, in listening (87%), vocabulary (79%) and reading (72%). In Seidlhofer (1999), 57% of her Australian NNESTs participants expressed that “their non-native proficiency in English makes them feel insecure rather than confident” (p. 241). This low self-esteem of NNESTs, alongside their perception that students usually grant the legitimacy to native English speaking Caucasians (e.g., Amin, 1997), generates among them an ‘imposter syndrome’ (Bernat, 2008) or ‘I-am-not-a-native-speaker syndrome’ (Suárez, 2000), which in turn leads to an even intense sense of inferiority (Reves & Medgyes, 1994). This psychological complex not only devastates their teaching effectiveness and even career development (e.g., Braine, 2010; Llorca, 2005), but also contributes to the reproduction and reinforcement of the superiority of NESTs (e.g., Holliday, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2012). As a corollary, Native-speakerism in this regard becomes domesticated or reified. For example, in studies on hiring NESTs in Expanding Circle countries, many local NNESTs maintained that it is normal for NESTs to get higher remunerations even if they themselves undertake the same teaching work as those NESTs (e.g., Methitham, 2012; Phothongsunan & Suwanarak, 2008).

Compared with the attitudinal studies focusing on students and teachers, those targeted exclusively or in part at the perceptions of ELT program administrators are small in quantity. Moreover, most of them were conducted in Inner Circle countries with a focus on the teacher employment issue. As with the complicated results of the studies on the attitudes of students and teachers, mixed opinions of the administrators were discovered. For example, Mahboob et al. (2004) conducted a questionnaire survey of 122 college-level ESL program administrators in the United States, finding that the NS identity, in addition to teaching and education experiences, serves as an important criterion in teacher employment based on the assumption that students prefer to learn English with NESTs. To be specific, 59.8% of the administrators considered this criterion at least somewhat important. Adopting the questionnaire of Mahboob et al. (2004), Clark and Paran (2007) conducted a survey in Britain and found that 72.3% of the 90 administrators of similar ESL programs judged the NS criterion to be either moderately



or very important. Albeit some criteria in relation to professionalism taken into account, “if an employer thinks ‘NS’ is ‘very important’ ... a candidate will be ruled out from consideration no matter how strong her or his teaching qualifications or educational background [can be]” (Clark & Paran, 2007, p. 422). By contrast, different criteria are revealed in the survey conducted by Moussu (2006b, 2010b) in America. 95.2% and 81% of the 25 ESL program administrators prioritized two hiring criteria, i.e., teaching experience and educational background whilst only 19.0% placed emphasis on the NS status. As regards the attitudes of ELT program administrators in countries beyond the Inner Circle, few empirical studies have been found available. Notwithstanding that, it can be inferred from the pro-nativeness criteria represented in teacher recruitment advertisements in those countries (e.g., Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Ruecker & Ives, 2015) that a predominant preference for NESTs exists among ESL/EFL program administrators, as they usually participate in enacting hiring policies or making hiring decisions. However, this inference needs to be verified by future studies.

Overall, the studies reviewed above reveal the pervasiveness of a pro-nativeness psyche among ELT stakeholders, indicating that Native-speakerism still exerts effects on the mentality of ELT stakeholders to a certain extent. However, oppositional and neutral attitudes are also observable. In addition, the studies indicate intra- and inter-group differences. For instance, the student participants as a whole seemed less committed to Native-speakerism than the other two stakeholder groups (see also Moussu & Llurda, 2008). It is noted that one significant point in viewing ESL/EFL teachers is centered on native-speakerhood, which serves as “a basic currency not only for labeling teachers but also for judging them” (Holliday, 2013, p. 18). This construct leads to another important dimension of ELT, i.e., the StE issue, which has been discussed heatedly in ELT and is becoming more outstanding against the current glocalization of the English language (e.g., Graddol, 1997, 2006; Jenkins, Cogo, & Dewey, 2011; Seidlhofer, 2011).

### Perceptions of different English language varieties

Of the studies on ELT stakeholders’ attitudes toward different English language varieties, most incorporate students and/or teachers as research subjects whereas few are targeted at exploring the opinions of ELT program administrators.

Two interweaved research questions were explored in the studies on the attitudes of students. One is about their general perceptions of different English language varieties and the other has to do with the English variety or varieties they themselves expect to learn, particularly certain accent(s) they prefer to acquire. As for the first question, Matsuda (2003b) conducted a study on 31 K-12 students in Japan. The analysis of the data collected via questionnaire surveys and interviews suggests that most of the students regarded NSs from the Inner Circle as the owner of English and therefore their English as StE. With regard to Japanese English, 61% of the participants expressed “disagreement” or “strong disagreement”, asserting that it should be avoided when using English because it’s not ‘correct’ or not ‘real English’ (ibid., p. 490). The endorsement for Inner Circle English, particularly Anglo-American English among the students was also revealed in relevant studies conducted in other Expanding Circle countries, such as China (e.g., Wang, 2015; Y. Wang, 2013). This finding is even corroborated by the those of many other studies on the attitudes of students from Outer Circle countries. For instance, Hundt et al. (2015) conducted a questionnaire survey in Fiji, finding out that British and American English were upheld as the English proper and the English pleasant by 48.3% (72) and 24.2% (36) of the 149 Fiji student participants respectively.

In addition to the positive perception of Inner Circle English, particularly Anglo-American English, many students were found upholding NS English, especially NS pronunciation or accent, as the learning target. For example, in the study conducted by Moore and Bounchan (2010) in Cambodia, 63.7% and 28.4% of 144 Cambodian university students expressed the desire to learn Anglo-American English respectively. Meanwhile, NS pronunciation is granted a supreme prestige. This is also evident in the study of Li (2009), who conducted a survey of 107 Chinese participants in Hong Kong (89 Chinese university students and 18 working adults). Data analysis indicates that about 84.1% of the participants expected to acquire NS accent. Most of them accorded positive attributes to this accent, from the general (e.g., ‘natural’ or ‘good’), to the aesthetic (e.g., ‘beautiful’ or ‘pleasant’), to the pragmatic (e.g., ‘more easily understood’) and then to the ownership and authority (e.g., ‘mother tongue’) (p. 100). In addition, more than 70% of the students expected to speak English like a NS, though expressing tolerance of others’ speaking English with NNS accent. Similar findings are observable in the study conducted by Xu and Van de Poel (2011), in which 50.7% of

the participants (university students in Flanders, Belgium) displayed different accent expectations for themselves and for others. The desire for acquiring NS pronunciation or accent among the student participants in these studies resonates with the responses of the students to similar questions in the study conducted by Timmis (2002), who recruited, in addition to 180 teachers from 45 countries, 400 students from 14 different countries as research participants. According to the data collected through questionnaire surveys, about 67% of the students expected to speak English like a NS. However, many students from Outer Circle countries appreciated the intelligibility criterion, i.e., to speak English clearly is more desirable than to acquire NS pronunciation or accent.

Despite the prevalent pro-nativeness attitude, research adopting the MGT technique indicates that a large number of student participants were unable to distinguish different English accents accurately. For example, Scales et al. (2006) conducted a study on 37 nonnative English learners via voice stimuli, i.e., tape recordings of four speakers – one American English speaker, one British English speaker, and the other two from Taiwan and Mexico, fluent in English yet keeping identifiable local accents. Findings suggest that 73% and 62% of the participants judged the American and British speakers as nonnative English speakers (henceforth NNSs) and that 8% and 24% regarded the Chinese and Mexican speakers as NSs respectively (*ibid.*, p. 725). Similar results can be seen found in other studies (e.g., Kelch & Santana-Williamson, 2002). Meanwhile, the popular claim about the low intelligibility of nonnative English language varieties was also found destitute of sustaining evidence. This is evident in the study conducted by Derwing & Munro (1997; as cited in Scales et al., 2006), whose NS participants – untrained Canadian native English speakers – were able to understand nonnative English accents and even transcribed accurately much of the perceived accented speech. All these findings seem to indicate that the predominant preference for Inner Circle English and NS accent among those students are not based on the verifiable linguistic superiority, but on the socially constructed StE ideology and the related pro-nativeness discourse (e.g., McKenzie, 2008; Tokumoto & Shibata, 2011).

Relevant attitudinal studies on NNESTs were intended to explore their stances regarding which English variety is StE and what variety should be selected for pedagogical use. As with the findings of the studies on the attitudes of the students, the predominant preference for Inner Circle English was found existing among NNESTs,

particularly those working in EFL contexts. For instance, the study of Sifakis and Sougari (2005) reveals that most of the 421 Greek state school teachers regarded NSs as the owner of the English language and preferred to teach NS pronunciation due to its claimed intelligibility in international communication. The four Korean teacher participants in the study conducted by Choe (2007) all considered American English StE and the best pedagogical model. All of these findings are supported by those revealed in the study of Jenkins (2007), whose teacher participants come from different Outer and Expanding Circle countries. The findings are also aligned with the results of a longitudinal study conducted by Young and Walsh (2010). They enlisted as research participants 26 international graduate students at a US university, who, however, had been English language teachers in their home countries before coming to America. The analysis of the data collected through interviews indicates that American English was expected to serve as the pedagogical model in the future by 84% of the teachers, followed by British English (15%) and nonnative local varieties (12%). In a more recent study conducted by Ahn (2014), who took 204 South Korean English teachers as research subjects and investigated their attitudes toward Korean English. Data collected through a questionnaire survey and semi-structured interviews suggest that although displaying positive attitudes toward Korean English, most of the teacher participants declared not to adopt it as a pedagogical variety. One of the reasons resides in that Korean English is seen as ‘incorrect English’ created by ‘non-native speakers of English’ (p. 213). The pro-nativeness mentality displayed by these studies seems to represent the effects of the StE ideology, according to which Inner Circle English is assumed to be of authenticity and intelligibility. This ideology was also found to enjoy strong social supports. For instance, one teacher participant in the small qualitative study conducted by Lai (2008) observed that either Received Pronunciation (RP) or General American accent (GA) is “an important requirement for your employer” (p. 42). Nevertheless, the relationship between societal factors and the attitudes of those teacher participants was not explored thoroughly in these studies.

As with many other EFL settings, the StE ideology was found dominating EFL education in China (e.g., Gong & Holliday, 2013; Wang, 2013). For instance, all the participants (1,261 university students from different disciplinary areas) in Hu (2004) regarded Anglo-American English as StE; 64.8% of the 171 student participants (English majors and non-English majors) in Kirkpatrick and Xu (2002) expected to bear

no Chinese accent when speaking English. Even the majority of the Chinese student participants at an international college located in China expressed the desire to acquire NS pronunciation or accent (Fang, 2016). Similar findings can be observed in the questionnaire survey of Wei (2016), in which 55.4 % of the 1196 Chinese non-English-major students expected their own English pronunciation to be approximate to RP or GA. However, the study of He and Zhang (2010) displayed a different picture. Adopting the questionnaire modeled after that of Timmis (2002), MGT and group interview, He and Zhang (2010) investigated the attitudes of Chinese CE stakeholders toward Inner Circle English and China English, an emerging English language variety that bears Chinese cultural characteristics but has not been legitimized (see Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002). The questionnaire surveys suggests that 56.6% of the 189 teachers expected their students to acquire NS-like pronunciation whereas 43.4% of the 795 students preferred accented intelligibility. It seems that the students as an entirety were more open-minded about the acquisition of NS pronunciation than were the teachers. Although the overall rating given to Inner Circle English was higher than that accorded to China English by the students during the MGT test, the discrepancy was not found significant. It seems that the conventional notion regarding the ownership of the English language and learning objective are changing, particularly among Chinese non-English-major students.

Based on the literature reviewed, no significant inter- and intra-group discrepancy in attitude toward (non)native English varieties has been found among the students and teachers, except among those in He & Zhang (2010). This is different from the mixed attitudes of these two groups of ELT stakeholders toward English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds displayed in the above section. Suggested by these studies, most of the students and teachers upheld Inner Circle English as being superior and the reference model for learning/teaching English. Although there is nothing wrong with their endorsing Anglo-American English because learners and teachers need to take an English variety as the reference model (e.g., Matsuda, 2012; Sung, 2013), what counts is that most of the participants in these studies failed to realize that all Englishes are equal linguistically when expressing support of Inner Circle English as the reference. This is evident from the merits that Inner Circle English was claimed to possess. For example, NS accent was claimed to be ‘beautiful’ or ‘pleasant’ (Li, 2009). It also matters that they were unaware of their derogation of Outer and Expanding Circle English when

valorizing Inner Circle English either as the linguistic correct or the learning/teaching proper. Following this line of thought, the studies reviewed in this subsection indicate that the students and teachers as a whole were trapped in the StE ideology or the traditional ELT paradigm that adheres to the modernistic view of language as a static and monolithic entity (e.g., Cogo, 2012; Dewey, 2015; Lin, 2013b). It seems that they possessed no knowledge about or refused to accept the pluralistic perspective of English advocated by the scholarship of World Englishes (henceforth WE), English as an international language (henceforth EIL) and/or English as a lingua franca (henceforth ELF) (e.g., Jenkins, 2007, 2009; Kachru, 1992b; Seidlhofer, 2005).

### Viewpoints about the cultural orientations of ELT

Within the conventional Native-speakerist ELT paradigm, learners are expected not only to acquire NS linguistic norms, but also to follow NS cultural models in using English (e.g., Baker, 2011; Dewey, 2015; Kirkpatrick, 2007a). Of the studies on the cultural orientations of ELT, most are reflections at the conceptual or theoretical level. Only a small number of empirical studies have been conducted with a focus on the stances of ELT stakeholders regarding whose culture to serve as the basis of curricular materials (Young & Sachdev, 2011) and/or what culture they expect most to teach or learn. Meanwhile, those studies are concentrated on the viewpoints of EFL teachers and students.

Rafieyan et al. (2013) carried out a questionnaire survey of Iranian EFL learners, intending to find out their attitudes toward the cultural orientation of EFL education. Altogether, 47 adult learners from a language institute participated in the survey. Data analysis indicates that most of the participants (80.1%) expressed a strong desire for learning British and/or American culture, claiming that “the culture materials featuring the target language people and country should be an integral part of everyday foreign language classroom instruction” (Rafieyan et al., 2013, p. 176). However, the case study by Jabeen and Shah (2011) at a Pakistani university suggests a strong opposition among students to incorporating Anglo-American culture. To be specific, 87% of the 94 undergraduate students expressed disagreement on learning American culture. Different from the contradictory findings of these two studies, the Vietnamese students in the qualitative research by Chinh (2013) seemed to display a strong multicultural awareness,

namely, all of them expected EFL curriculum to include cultures of different countries or regions.

As with the studies on students, complicated attitudes were found among teachers. For instance, Sung and Chen (2009) investigated the viewpoints of Chinese EFL teachers in Taiwan on cultural orientations of EFL education. 146 Taiwanese EFL teachers of English departments at 13 universities in Taiwan participated in the questionnaire study. Data analysis indicates that most of the teachers agreed on that EFL curriculum should be orientated to the target culture, i.e., Inner Circle culture. They asserted that teaching Inner Circle culture helps to facilitate students' proficiency in the English language because it can enhance their learning motivation, communicative competence and international understandings. All of these findings are corroborated by those of Önalın (2005), who conducted a study on Turkish EFL teachers through a questionnaire survey and interviews. By contrast, 64% (32) of the 50 Chilean EFL teachers in the survey conducted by McKay (2003a) expressed strong support of the instructional content embedded in the life and culture of various countries, though granting more values to the instruction of the target culture. This multicultural awareness reverberates in the findings of Monfared (2016). Of the 244 teacher participants from the three Kachruvian circles in their study, about 86.9% insisted on the necessity to incorporate cultures of different countries or regions as part of ELT curricular content. Most of the NNEST participants in the study conducted by Bayyurt (2006) also expressed agreement on the educational significance of teaching international culture and learners' home culture. However, they tended to associate international culture with Anglo-American culture.

Complicated findings are also evident in studies that investigate the attitudes of Chinese university students in China. For example, Zhang and Ma (2004) found that most of their student participants expected English teaching and learning materials to embrace cultures of different countries, including Chinese culture. Liu & Laohawiriyanon (2014) discovered that Chinese students in their study as a whole prioritized Chinese culture, followed by the target culture and then the cultures of other countries. By contrast, the majority of the student participants in the study conducted by Xiao (2010) expressed a strong desire to learn the target and source culture, showing few interests in the cultures of other countries.

Overall, these studies suggest that although the traditional Native-speakerist mindset in support of Inner Circle culture was found still lingering in the psyche of ELT stakeholders, an awareness of the importance of learning/teaching the source and the international culture has emerged on the part of many EFL teachers and learners. Reverberated in this awareness is the theoretical purport of Cortezzi and Jin (1999) on incorporating into ELT curriculum three types of culture – the target culture (the culture of Inner Circle countries), the source culture (learners’ national culture) and the international culture (cultures of other English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries). Interestingly, this multicultural awareness and the predominant endorsement for Inner Circle English discussed in the preceding subsection contradict each other. One logical question arises, namely, whether the participants in support of teaching/learning international culture hold a real pluralistic view of the English language. It is also noted that despite the merits of these studies, few of them have explored the cultural orientation of ELT from the perspective of cultural politics in relation to Native-speakerism.

#### Opinions about communicative language teaching approach

As regards ELT stakeholders’ opinions about CLT, a plethora of studies have been conducted, with a focus on those engaged in EFL education in Expanding Circle countries. Specifically, most of the studies took EFL teachers and/or learners as research subjects to explore two interconnected questions, namely, what attitude they hold toward the general principle of CLT and whether this teaching approach should be adopted for classroom instruction. By contrast, studies on the opinions of EFL program administrators in this regard were rarely conducted. As with the studies on NNESTs versus NESTs issue and those on the cultural orientations of ELT, research in this topic area indicates complicated findings.

The complexity is evident in the responses of student participants to these two questions. For instance, Savignon and Wang (2003) conducted a questionnaire survey to measure the attitudes toward CLT held by Taiwanese students. 174 first-year university students participated in the study. Data analysis indicates that the students as a whole expressed agreement on the general communication-oriented principle of CLT, as is evidenced by the popular statement among them, “Learning English is to use this language”



(ibid., p. 238). To be specific, 88% of the students expressed a preference for this meaning-based pedagogical approach and expected it to be adopted in classroom teaching rather than the conventional form-based one. This finding is consistent with that of Chung and Huang (2010), most of whose high school student participants were also positive about this communication-oriented language teaching approach, though the English program for them was exam-oriented. However, Matsuura (2001) found that 80.4% of their Japanese student participants indicated strong favor for the teacher-centered approach or the conventional teaching mode that concentrates on learning isolated language skills and improving linguistic accuracy. In addition, the attitudes expressed by those students were found attributable to many factors, such as their English learning experiences and/or English language proficiency.

As with the studies on students, those on teachers manifest complexity in attitude toward CLT. For example, Chang (2011) found that the 55 teacher participants from two universities in Taiwan as an entirety displayed a favorable attitude toward the espoused principles of CLT. This is confirmed in Karim's (2004) survey of university teachers in Bangladesh. However, negative opinions arose in studies regarding the implementation of CLT. In a large-scale study focusing on primary school teachers in Hong Kong, Carless (2004) discovered that teachers often encountered classroom management or discipline problems when applying CLT to classroom instruction. In particular, they were not satisfied with the quantity of students' English output when the students were asked to conduct pair or group work. The latter finding is confirmed in the study conducted by Lee (2005) in Korea, who found that students depended excessively on their L1 rather than the target language in solving communicative problems in classroom pair and group work. Other studies illustrate that many teachers often felt "caught between government recommendations [for adopting CLT] on the one hand and the demands of students and parents for a more examination-oriented classroom instruction on the other" (Shim & Baik, 2004, as cited in Littlewood, 2014, p. 245). In addition, differences in social and educational culture were found to be one major reason for opposing the application of CLT to classroom teaching on the part of many teachers. For example, the study of Chowdhury and Phan (2008) indicates that the traditional role of teachers envisaged in Asian society prevents the implementation of CLT. According to the collective response from their teacher participants, most of the teachers were unwilling to "give up their authoritative and somewhat distanced role

of the traditional teacher” (p 310). Strong oppositions are also observable in the study by Hiep (2007), all of whose Vietnamese EFL teacher participants expressed worries about the constraining effects of the sociocultural factors in Vietnam on the application of CLT to classroom instruction, though this teaching approach itself was considered sophisticated or advanced. Frequently mentioned factors comprise, for example, “lack of a real environment for students to use English”, “students’ hope to pass exams for a university degree only” and/or “the local culture that challenges group work” (p. 198).

These complicated findings resonate with those of the studies that focus on the EFL context in China. For example, Liao’s (2003) quantitative study reveals that 94.2% of the 302 high school Chinese EFL teachers were supportive of the implementation of CLT. However, all the Chinese university EFL teachers in Li (2004) study asserted that it is difficult for CLT to be implemented in China due to many obstructing factors, particularly the constraints derived from China’s specific examination system, EFL context, cultural tradition and culture of learning, though they acknowledged the merits of CLT. Similar findings are revealed by most of the studies targeted at the mindset of Chinese students. For instance, Rao (2002) discovered through a questionnaire survey and semi-structure interviews that most of his 30 Chinese English-major students expressed preferences for non-communicative activities in class, albeit their agreement on the general principle of CLT. In addition, the overall attitudinal tendency among those students were found related to many factors ranging from lack of motivation for communicative competence, traditional learning styles or habits, and the status of English as a foreign language in China. All of these complicated findings contradict Liao’s claim that “CLT is best for China” (2004, p. 270), but agree on the purport for a “Context Approach” (Bax, 2003) or an ecological approach (e.g., Hu, 2002, 2005; Rao, 2013).

Observed from the studies discussed above, complexity exists regarding the viewpoints of EFL teachers and learners on the general principles of CLT and the implementation of this teaching approach in classroom instruction. Despite the overall endorsement for the communication-oriented principle of CLT, more voices were found to arise countering the classroom implementation of CLT mostly on cultural and educational account. Although these studies explored the attitudes of EFL teachers and students toward CLT, they tended to focus on the likes and dislikes of the stakeholders. This

research parameter could be seen as a result of the ideology that teaching approaches and/or methods are scientific, apolitical and neutral instruments (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2003a; Pennycook, 1998). It is therefore that few of these studies took into account the pedagogical imperialism associated with the promotion of CLT and the attendant ideological effects on the conventional education cultures of Outer and Expanding Circle countries. In addition, most of the studies reviewed above were conducted about 10 years ago and it is necessary to know about the current mentality of the stakeholders regarding this issue.

### 2.2.2 Limitations

The review of the attitudinal studies concerning the four thematic dimensions of ELT suggests mixed findings. The participants as an entirety granted endorsement for Inner Circle English (e.g., Ahn, 2014; Jenkins, 2007; McKenzie, 2008). However, conflicting attitudes were expressed toward NESTs (e.g., He & Miller, 2011; Ma, 2012; Moussu, 2006b), Inner Circle culture (e.g., McKay, 2003a; Rafieyan et al., 2013) and CLT (Chang, 2011; Hiep, 2007). Notwithstanding this complexity, it is evident that Native-speakerism still exerts ideological effects on ELT stakeholders. Despite these valuable findings, these studies as a whole are characterised with limitations in research design that prevent them from acquiring comprehensive and profound knowledge regarding the effects of this chauvinistic ideology on the mindset of those participants.

The limitation of these studies in providing the comprehensive knowledge about the ideological effects of Native-speakerism can be viewed from three perspectives. Firstly, most of the studies reviewed in the above subsection are aimed at investigating the attitudes of the ELT stakeholders toward Native-speakerism in one or two thematic dimension(s) of ELT, and none has taken into account simultaneously the ideological effects of this chauvinistic ideology in the four aforementioned respects of ELT. As such, they only reveal part of the mentality of those ELT stakeholders appertaining to Native-speakerism. Secondly, most of the studies took teachers and/or students as research subjects, leaving ELT program administrators underrepresented or even unrepresented. Given that students, teachers and administrators are directly involved in everyday ELT practice and their beliefs usually reproduces or counters the dominant ideology in this educational enterprise (e.g., Pajares, 1992; Richards & Rodgers, 2014), members from

each of these three stakeholder groups should be sampled as research subjects. The mere focus on one or two group(s) cannot explicate the overall attitudinal propensity of ELT stakeholders regarding Native-speakerism. Thirdly, most of the studies are small in scale in terms of participant size, except a few that concentrate on the NESTs versus NNESTs dichotomy (e.g., He & Miller, 2011; Moussu, 2006b) and the NS English versus NNS English issue (e.g., Timmis, 2002; Wang, 2013). This is particularly true of the studies focusing on the cultural orientations of ELT and CLT (e.g., Chang, 2011; McKay, 2003a). Based on these three strands of limitations, it can be concluded that these studies cannot illuminate the ideological effects of Native-speakerism on those ELT stakeholders comprehensively.

The failure of the attitudinal studies reviewed to provide in-depth information on the ideological effects resides in research purpose and data analysis method. As stated earlier, most of them were intended to find out the viewpoints of ELT stakeholders on the nativeness principle in order to provide suggestions on adjusting ELT practices to satisfy the needs of the stakeholders, for example, the demands of the students for learning a certain type of English variety (see Subtirelu, 2013; Young & Walsh, 2010). This may help to explain why a large proportion of the studies are quantitative and descriptive in design (e.g., Hundt et al., 2015; McKay, 2003a; Moussu, 2006b; Savignon & Wang, 2003). Among those that are qualitative and those that adopt a mixed approach, the qualitative data were usually analyzed in accordance with content analysis, with the aim to describe the general attitudes held by the stakeholders toward the nativeness principle or to provide instantiating support for the quantitative findings (e.g., Fang, 2016). In this sense, these studies did not take into account factors that sustain the attitudes, *inter alia*, how the attitudes are interacted with the dynamics of ideology, discourse and power in the sociocultural and/or historical-political context where ELT operates, as if the stance for or against Native-speakerism is asocial, apolitical and ideologically free. For instance, CLT, alongside other teaching approaches or methods emanating from the English speaking West, has been criticized as the representative of the ethnocentricity of Inner Circle culture and the product of colonialism (Pennycook, 1998, p. 19). The promotion of CLT in Outer and Expanding Circle countries may reproduce, reinforce, and perpetuate the pedagogical hegemony of Inner Circle countries (e.g., Holliday, 1994, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, 2006; McKay, 2003b; Phan, 2008, 2014). Nevertheless, almost none of the attitudinal studies

discussed above attempts to explore the stakeholders' awareness of the Self versus Other politics behind CLT, in particular the culture-correction efforts of the Self and the cultural self-discrimination of the Other that underpin the promotion of this pedagogical approach in global ELT. Observed from these perspectives, the attitudinal studies reviewed in this chapter have made limited, if any, contributions to disinvesting Native-speakerism and waking up the stakeholders' critical awareness of this chauvinistic ideology.

In view of the limitations of the previous attitudinal studies reviewed in this section, future research should focus on more dimensions or respects of ELT and incorporate more categories of ELT stakeholders in order to find out the comprehensive ideological effects of Native-speakerism. It will be much of help to adopt a critical approach to explore what lies behind the attitudes, i.e., their ideological base(s). In comparison with the critical approaches that have been adopted to explore inequalities in ELT, such as Marxism and post-colonialism (e.g., Phillipson, 1992), CDA can be regarded as an effective approach to explore Native-speakerism. The most important reason lies in that Native-speakerism as a chauvinistic ideology has become domesticated in everyday ELT discourse whereas CDA, as a theory and a method for analyzing the reciprocal relation between discourse and society, is committed to making explicit the ideology and the unequal power relations reproduced by and reproducing naturalized discourse(s) (e.g., Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). In fact, many scholars (e.g., Holliday, 2005, 2015) have proposed that CDA be resorted to as a theoretical lens through which to view Native-speakerism. It is noted that the merits of the attitudinal studies reviewed in this section cannot be denied, albeit their limitations. At least, they can provide references for future critical studies on this issue.

### **2.3 Critical studies**

Despite the proposal for exploring Native-speakerism in ELT from CDA approach, most of the empirical studies still adhere to the modernistic positivist research paradigm and those that adopt CDA lens are small in quantity. Of those critical studies, only four have been found closely related to this study. The dearth of such studies formulates a stark contrast to the gigantic enterprise of ELT in the current world (see Crystal, 2003)

and to the prevailing ideological and discursive struggles against Native-speakerism (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, 2008; Llurda, 2005, 2009; Matsuda, 2012). Moreover, the four studies were intended to expose the ideology hidden in teacher recruitment advertisements, textbooks or education policies, rather than probe into the effects of this ideology on the mentality of those who are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice – teachers, students and administrators. This section is to delineate these four studies first and then discuss their limitations.

### 2.3.1 Four CDA studies on Native-speakerism

Setting out from the ideological struggles against Native-speakerism in ELT (e.g., Braine, 2010; Holliday, 2005), particularly the findings of the studies on the advertisements for recruiting ESL/EFL teachers (e.g., Mahboob & Golden, 2013; Selvi, 2010), Ruecker and Ives (2015) adopted the approach of CDA to analyze the Native-speakerist ideology embedded in web-based teacher recruitment advertisements in East Asian countries. 59 websites were sampled for macro analysis whereas two of them were selected for microanalysis. Suggested by the macro analysis, the NS standard is raised exactly in 81% of the websites, many of which even make it explicit that the applicants must hold valid passports from White native English speaking countries. Meanwhile, 85% of the websites presented degree criterion, requiring that the applicants should have a Bachelor's degree at least. However, this requirement seems "to be ensuring [the prospective teachers'] English fluency and perhaps maturity more than the acquisition of EFL pedagogy" (Ruecker & Ives, 2015, p. 11), as is evident from the statement that their academic degrees could be from any discipline. Furthermore, relevant working experiences were required of the prospective teachers only in 14% of the websites. In this sense, these advertisements represent, reproduce and further enact the ideology in ELT that White native speakers of English from Inner Circle countries are the ideal English language teachers. The microanalysis of the two websites indicates that the visual and written messages mention repeatedly the benefits that the teaching jobs in East Asian Countries can bring to prospective expatriate ELT practitioners rather than stating job requirements. For example, teaching English in those countries was described as an opportunity "to make money, travel, and experience adventures in exotic culture" (Ruecker & Ives, 2015, p. 1). Although the adoption of such rhetoric can be seen as a tactic to attract White applicants, it entails the uncritical acquiescence

of those countries to the traditional “othered” or Orientalist image imposed on them by the West (Said, 1978). Drawing on these findings, the study concludes that the specter of Native-speakerism is still kicking in ELT (see also Phillipson, 2012).

Xiong and Qian (2012) employed CDA to examine the ideology concerning the English language with a focus on a set of high school EFL textbooks used in China, *Advance with English Student’s Book 3* (2004), co-published by a Chinese publishing group and the Oxford University Press. The authors concentrated their attention on the essay – entitled “English and its history” – in the first unit of the textbook, analyzing how the English language is represented discursively. Drawing on the detailed textual analysis, they arrived at three findings. Firstly, the history of English is selectively represented, with some information over-worded and others omitted or at the best slightly mentioned, resulting in English being objectified as a language “that never seems to spread beyond the British Isles” (Xiong & Qian, 2012, p. 82). For example, the information of “the second diaspora” (Kachru, 1992, p. 231), i.e., the expansion of the English language to former British colonies, is left off. Such content organization represents “an ideological position that prefers English to be solely possessed by its traditional ‘base’, Britain” (Xiong & Qian, 2012, p. 81). Secondly, Standard English is represented as a neutral instrument for transmitting information, and other English language varieties are named as geographical “dialects” with a limited communication scope. This viewpoint, according to the authors, represents another pro-nativeness position, which promotes Inner Circle English for educational and professional purposes whilst dismissing Outer and Expanding Circle English, with the structural and cultural inequalities between different English language varieties naturalized consequently (Xiong & Qian, 2012, p. 83). Thirdly, the text advocates grammatical prescriptivism. It requires learners to adhere to Inner Circle English norms as the grammatically preferable, refusing “to recognize and celebrate the situated creativity and hybridity of local varieties” (Xiong & Qian, 2012, p. 86). The authors concluded that all these findings are related to the StE ideology and the instrumental mentality in the field of EFL education in China.

Lee (2011) also adopted CDA as a conceptual guideline to explore the ideology in EFL textbooks used in South Korean high schools, but focused on the cultural orientation of textbook content. The study was aimed at finding out whether the cultural orientation dovetails with that of relevant government policies, i.e., the economic, political and

educational policies enacted by the South Korean government for the sake of promoting its economic development and establishing its global leadership against the backdrop of the current globalization. Through analyzing three sets of EFL textbooks widely adopted in South Korea high schools, it was found that textbook content is presented under four dichotomizing and dichotomized themes. They comprise “Legal/Illegal Action, Capability/Incapability, Equality/Inequality, and High/Low Quality of Education” (ibid., p. 52), with the positive traits of each dichotomous pair unanimously granted to the West, particularly the US society. These findings suggest that the government policies and the cultural orientation of EFL textbooks are not in harmony with each other. The author traced the formation of this pro-West ideology in textbooks to the influence of the Korean War and the post-war aids from America as well as the current globalization, in which South Korea takes the West, the US in particular, as the ideal to imitate in order to improve its economic, political and cultural status on the international stage. These historical-political factors are asserted to account for why Western, *inter alia*, “American ideologies, values and culture, as well as the language itself, were portrayed as being superior to those of Korea” (Baik, 1994, as cited in Lee, 2011, p. 58) in these EFL textbooks, with the supremacy of Anglo-American culture further reinforced in EFL education.

Hashimoto (2013) analyzed the educational policies in Japan with CDA as a tool in order to find out how NSs are represented discursively in these documents. Findings illustrate that NSs are portrayed merely as a resource to be utilized in EFL education. For example, “Children can have two way-way communication with native speakers” (ibid., p. 164). Except this merit, NSs are considered less valuable even than information and communication technology. Moreover, those documents reviewed represents NSs not as teachers but teaching assistants whilst granting the central role to local Japanese English teachers in ELT. The author claims that such representations of NSs reflect the “systematic exclusion of foreign teachers from full-time employment in the public education sector” as well as “Japan’s answers to the ‘monolingual fallacy’, the ‘native speaker fallacy’, or the ‘inferiority complex’ [of Japanese English teachers and learners]” (ibid., p. 168). In this logic, these findings seem to suggest an anti-Native-speakerism ideology in those official ELT documents. Interestingly, it stays in contrast to the strong pro-nativeness psyche on the part of Japanese EFL teachers and/or learners, as revealed in many attitudinal studies (see McKenzie, 2013).



### 2.3.2 Limitations

These four studies adopted CDA to analyze the ideology represented in teacher hiring advertisements, textbooks and education policies in reference to Native-speakerism. As with the attitudinal studies (Section 2.2.1), they reveal mixed ideological orientations, namely, Native-speakerism as a chauvinistic ideology is still deeply entrenched in the advertisements and textbooks whereas undergoing changes in education policies. Given the dearth of critical studies and the difference in research setting, this complicity warrants further studies. As with the attitudinal studies reviewed in this chapter, the four CDA studies were found to have two major limitations, which exist primarily at the methodological level.

One limitation resides in that the four studies did not attach sufficient attention to contextual factors related to ELT, particularly the sociocultural and historical-political variables. This is a typical weakness of many CDA studies, which tend to focus on available discourse without taking into account the conditions where the discourse is produced and circulated as well as the historical trajectory of the discourse (e.g., Blommaert, 2005), thereby constrained in providing effective, persuasive or convincing explanations (e.g., Widdowson, 1998b). As stated previously (see Section 1.1), Native-speakerism was originated from the education and development culture of the English speaking West, but has become accepted by Outer and Expanding Circle countries on account of the economic, military and epistemic hegemony of the West (e.g., Holliday, 2005, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, 2016; Phillipson, 1992, 2009). Nevertheless, it manifests itself in different ways in different ELT contexts (Houghton & Rivers, 2013, p. 5). In this sense, the origin of Native-speakerism, the power relations between the Centre and the Periphery as well as the specific sociocultural and historical-political contexts where ELT is conducted should be taken into account to ensure the validity of the findings on how the Native-speakerist ideology is represented, reproduced and/or resisted. Unfortunately, it seems that in analyzing the teacher recruitment advertisements in East Asian countries, Ruecker and Ives (2015) did not interpret and explain the data in reference to the contemporary sociocultural conditions surrounding EFL education in those countries, and thereby cannot illuminate adequately how and why those advertisements reproduce and enact Native-speakerism. Hashimoto (2013)

provided no historical-political information in relation to Native-speakerism within the Japanese EFL education system before concluding that Japanese ELT policies represent an anti-Native-speakerism ideology. Although Xiong and Qian (2012) provided a large amount of sociocultural information about the English language and EFL education in contemporary China, they did not resort to it explicitly when interpreting and explaining how the English language is represented in that set of EFL textbooks. By contrast, Lee (2011) incorporated the sociocultural and historical-political conditions in South Korea when interpreting and explaining how and why the content of those South Korean EFL textbooks represent and reproduce cultural self-discrimination. However, his study could have been further improved if he had taken into account the historical source and development of Native-speakerism in global ELT.

The other has to do with the reliability and validity of the data. This is reflected in three of the four studies – with that of Ruecker and Ives (2015) as an exception. Of the three, two seem to be aligned with the methodology of most CDA studies conducted in the 1990s, many of which tended to choose “short fragments of data” (Stubbs, 1997, p. 7), but “presented [them] as representative without any explanation as to how this representativeness has been established” (e.g., Breeze, 2011, p. 504). This is evident in the study conducted by Xiong and Qian (2012), who only analyzed the essay in one unit of an EFL textbook and then claimed that the findings represent the ideological orientation or tendency of the whole textbook. Likewise, the claim of Hashimoto (2013) about the existence of an anti-Native-speakerism ideology in Japanese EFL policies is based on the analysis of a few sentences or paragraphs selected from several educational documents. The results of these two studies are therefore destitute of convincing force due to the limited size of the data, which seem to be selected at the will or convenience of the researchers. In this case, the findings seem to be merely subjective interpretations of the data that are selected according to their priori ideological convictions (e.g., Schegloff, 1997; Slembrouck, 2001; Widdowson, 1998b) rather than “the results of a careful step-by-step analysis that reflexively questions its own observations and conclusions” (Verschuere, 2001, as cited in Breeze, 2011, p. 505). In contrast to these two studies, Lee (2011) gathered a large amount of data from three sets of EFL textbooks that were widely used in South Korea. As Lee stated, “I examined texts and identified textbook segments in which people and cultures of various countries were mentioned [...] the identified textbook passages were then compressed into summaries”

(p. 50). Notwithstanding the merits of his data collection method, the findings of Lee (2011) could be more reliable and valid if the statistics of these discourse segments and the frequency of the abstracted themes – “Legal/Illegal Action, Capability/Incapability, Equality/Inequality, and High/Low Quality of Education” – had been calculated and referenced in justifying his standpoints.

## **2.4 Summary**

This chapter reviews two categories of empirical research on Native-speakerism. The first one comprises a plethora of studies investigating the attitudes of ELT stakeholders – students, teachers and administrators – toward Native-speakerism to do with English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds, English language varieties, cultural orientations of ELT and the approach of CLT respectively. By contrast, the second category of literature only consists of four studies that adopted CDA to explore this ideology in English teacher recruitment advertisements, the cultural orientation of EFL textbooks, the image of Inner Circle English depicted in EFL textbooks and the role of NESTs represented in EFL policies or regulations.

The review of the attitudinal studies indicates that global ELT is still haunted by Native-speakerism. This is reflected explicitly in the overall agreement of the participants on the superiority traditionally granted to Inner Circle English, though mixed viewpoints in relation to Native-speakerism were expressed regarding the other three aspects of ELT. Moreover, the studies as an entirety are characterised with limitations that prevent them from gaining a comprehensive and in-depth insight into the ideological effects of Native-speakerism on ELT stakeholders. Firstly, none of the studies has incorporated simultaneously the four dimensions of ELT and the three groups of stakeholders who are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice. Secondly, most of the studies are small in scale in terms of participant number. Thirdly, they are aimed at investigating the stakeholders’ attitudes at the surface level, without exploring them in reference to the dynamics of discourse, ideology and power in specific ELT settings and within global ELT. The review of the four critical studies also demonstrates the entrenchment of Native-speakerism in ELT. Although adopting the approach of CDA, the four studies did not attach sufficient attention to contextual variables, particularly the historical-

political factors in analyzing and interpreting data. Meanwhile, problems also exist as to the data size and the related reliability and validity in three of the studies. In addition, none of these four CDA studies takes as a focus the attitudes of ELT stakeholders toward Native-speakerism. Notwithstanding the limitations of these CDA studies, they set up a new parameter to follow in researching Native-speakerism.

As stated previously (see Section 1.1), EFL education in China has been governed by Native-speakerism (e.g., Gong & Holliday, 2013; Wang & Hill, 2011). It is currently gigantic in scale (e.g., Bolton & Graddol, 2012; He, 2015; Wei & Su, 2012) and this entails a great potential contribution to the development of the English language and global ELT. However, the review of the literature indicates that Native-speakerism in China's ELT is underexplored. More studies focusing on ELT in China are therefore needed. In view of the limitations of previous research, this study is determined to adopt CDA as the theoretical guideline and its discourse-historical approach (DHA) as the methodological tool to explore whether – if so, to what extent – ELT in China is still affected by this chauvinistic ideology through investigating related attitudes of Chinese ELT stakeholders. In order to achieve a comparatively comprehensive finding, this study intends to incorporate three categories of ELT stakeholders (students, teachers and administrators) and explore their perceptions of four respects of ELT to do with teachers, English language varieties, cultural orientations and teaching approaches. Details of the theoretical framework and the methodological design for this study are presented and discussed respectively in the following two chapters.

## **Chapter 3 CDA and the DHA Approach**

### **3.1 Introduction**

Chapter 2 reviews both attitudinal and critical studies pertinent to Native-speakerism, pointing out the ideological trend in global ELT as well as the limitations of those studies. It is suggested that this study take CDA as a macro theoretical lens and DHA as a micro methodological approach to explore the current ideological landscape of EFL education in China with a focus on the viewpoints of Chinese EFL stakeholders on four aspects of ELT in relation to Native-speakerism.

This chapter delineates the theoretical framework for this study. Following the general introduction (Section 3.1), Section 3.2 illuminates the macro theoretical purport of CDA paradigm on the reciprocal dynamics of discourse and society as well as its social concern and objective. Section 3.3 elaborates on the triangulating methodology of DHA, its historical-political perspective on how discourse interacts with society as well as the concrete methods or strategies for textual analysis. These two sections also explicate why and how these theoretical and methodological purports are applicable to this study. The chapter concludes in Section 3.4 with a summary of the major content of the preceding sections.

### **3.2 CDA as a theoretical guideline**

CDA, as a multidisciplinary research orientation or paradigm originated from the late 1970s, is preoccupied with social problems in their linguistic aspects rather than with language per se (Titscher et al., 2000, p. 146). It is in fact a social study of language and a linguistic study of society, as it is aimed at exposing the opaque ideology and power relations underpinning “the connections/relationships between language use, its producers and consumers, and the social and political contexts, structures, and practices in which it occurs” (Waugh et al, 2016, p. 72). The results of social-linguistic analysis are expected to serve as the guideline for solving social problems (e.g., Faiclough, 1995; Slembrouck, 2001) or “transforming social and political systems to make them more equal and democratic” (Graham, 2018, p. 186). These two macro conceptions are

regarded as the distinctive perspectives of CDA paradigm on the relationship between discourse and society and on that between analysis and the practices analyzed (e.g., Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258; Wodak, 1997, p. 173; 1999). This section is to elaborate on these two perspectives as well as their relations to this study.

In terms of the relationship between discourse and society, CDA adopt both a materialistic view of the world and an idealistic one (Richardson, 2007, pp. 27-29), asserting that discourse as written or verbal language use is part of the social process (Fairclough, 1989, 1995, 2003) and is interacted dialectically with material elements and intertextualized with other discursive practices within and across different layers of sociocultural contexts (e.g., Blackledge, 2005; Blommaert, 2005; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; van Dijk, 2001a). To put it succinctly, “discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned” (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, p. 448). Fairclough and Wodak (1997) further elaborate on this relationship.

Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particularly discursive event and the situation(s), institutions(s) and social structure(s), which frame it ... the discursive event is shaped by situations, institutions and social structures, but it also shapes them ... it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive of both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it (p. 258).

Nevertheless, the dialectical relationship between discourse and society does not take place automatically. The establishment, maintenance and transformation of this relationship are contingent on the dynamic interactions of discourse, ideology and power in social practices (Fairclough, 1995; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). On the one hand, discourse can serve as an instrument to transmit, reproduce and reinforce ideology and power (e.g., Chilton, 2004; Fairclough, 1989, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). One of the major reasons resides in that ideology constitutes the background knowledge or schemata presupposed by or activating language use (Fairclough, 1995, p. 35). In the meantime, power can make one discourse rather than another more socially significant (e.g., van Dijk, 2008) and ensure that “[certain] orders of discourse are ideologically harmonized internally” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 30). Since the dominant have more control over or access to public discourse, they have more chances to have their worldviews promoted (e.g., Fairclough, 1989, 1992; van Dijk, 2008). When their ideology gains the consent or acquiescence from the dominated, it will become legitimized in a wider social range

and then developed into a more naturalized or reified “group attitude” (Wallis, 1998, p. 23) or “group schemata” (van Dijk, 1995, p. 19), on the basis of which future discursive practices are conducted. The consequence is the reproduction or reinforcement of the hegemony (Gramsci, 1971) or the “symbolic power” (Bourdieu, 1989) of the dominant. On the other hand, discourse per se is also a site of ideological and power struggles, where language can be used to challenge the existing power relations and ideology in the short and long terms (e.g., Reese & Wodak, 2009, p. 89; Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 10). Although the dominant can usually “determine how language is used, what effects it has, and how it reflects, serves and furthers the interests, positions, perspectives and values of those in power” (Waugh et al., 2016) or make certain orders of discourse ideologically harmonious internally (Fairclough, 1989, p. 30; see also van Dijk, 2008), the dominated are not passive consumers of the ideology promoted by the dominant, as human beings possess the agency to “act otherwise” (Giddens, 1979, as cited in Mumby, 2005, p. 28). Ideological conflicts and power struggles then emerge in the site of discourse. Observed from these two perspectives, the critical analysis of discourse can reveal whether the dominated conform to and/or fight against the dominance of the dominant (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 89).

The perspective of CDA paradigm on the relationship between analysis and the practices analyzed refers to its political motive or sense of social mission, particularly the pursuit of social emancipation among the analysts. According to Wodak (1997), CDA is not a “dispassionate and objective social science” (p. 174). It does not stop at analyzing “the discursive construction of racial, gender, and other social and cultural categories, identities, and stereotypes that legitimate and perpetuate discrimination against particular groups of people” (Lin, 2013a, p. 2). Rather, CDA is intended to propose, produce and transmit knowledge “that enables human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-determination” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 7) through demystifying the social problems that are (re)produced out of biased ideologies and unequal power relations engraved in and legitimized by naturalized discourses (e.g., Fairclough, 1989, 1995; Titscher et al., 2000). As such, CDA can fulfil its advocated moral and political interventionism by means of “empowering the powerless, giving voices to the voiceless, exposing power abuse, and mobilizing people to remedy social wrongs” (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, p. 449). In the words of van Dijk (2001),

CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality (p. 352).

These two theoretical purports of CDA paradigm on the relationship between discourse and society and between analysis and the practices analyzed are commensurate with the theoretical perspective, focus and practical objective of this study. As stated previously (see Section 1.1), Native-speakerism, as a chauvinistic ideology, stems from the English speaking West, whose hegemony has rendered this ideology a naturalized belief in global ELT, constantly reproduced, enacted and reproduced in everyday ELT texts and talks, i.e., small discourse produced particularly by those who are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice (Holliday, 2005, p. 7). A similar phenomenon was also found existing in the history of China's EFL education (see Section 1.4). This is why the present study concentrates on what Chinese ELT stakeholders say or write about different dimensions of everyday ELT practice. Given the historical hegemony of Native-speakerism as well as the recent resistant voices from the NESTs Movement and the scholarship on the globalization of the English language and the cultural politics in ELT (e.g., Braine, 2010; Kumaravadivelu, 2012, 2016; Pennycook, 1998; Tupas, 2015), the critical analysis of the oral and written texts is conducive for exposing the possible continuation of Native-speakerism and/or the potential ideological struggles against Native-speakerism on the part of Chinese ELT stakeholders. This in turn can disclose the current ideological landscape of China's ELT in relation to Native-speakerism and by extension the power relations between the Centre and the Periphery in China's EFL education. In this sense, this study is commensurate with the macro theoretic purport of CDA on the dialectical relationship between discourse and society, particularly "the way discourse (re)produces social domination ... and how dominated groups discursively [conform to or] resist such abuse" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 9).

As with CDA paradigm, this study does not stop at the level of exposing the "opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak, 1995, as cited in Blommaert, 2005, p. 25). Acknowledging Native-speakerism as an established chauvinistic ideology in ELT has devastated the ecology of global ELT (see Section 1.1), this study is aimed at proposing



solutions to the unequitable and unethical problems brought about by the possible conformity of Chinese ELT stakeholders to this ideology. Specifically, it is intended to intervene on the side of ELT stakeholders by waking up their critical awareness of the spectre of Native-speakerism and its pernicious effects and proposing concrete resisting measures for the construction of a (more) democratic, equitable and ethical ELT world. In this sense, it dovetails with the political motive for social emancipation pursued by CDA.

### **3.3 DHA as a methodological approach**

Within CDA paradigm, there are different approaches, such as the dialectical-relational approach (e.g., Fairclough, 2003, 2009), the sociocognitive approach (e.g., van Dijk, 1993, 2009) or the discourse-historical approach (e.g., Wodak, 2010, 2012), among others. All of them maintain that discourse is a social practice and take the solution of social problems and social emancipation as a social mission. However, each approach has its own perspective from which to view the dialectical relationship of discourse and society and has developed its idiosyncratic research methodology. For instance, the dialectical-relational approach adopts a synchronic perspective on the relationship between discourse and society and tends to follow Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) in analyzing texts. The sociocognitive approach emphasizes the interface of mind, discursive interaction and society and focuses on detailed analysis of texts and their embedded contexts. DHA – developed out of the studies on racial discrimination, national identity and Self versus Other politics (e.g., Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) – adopts a historical perspective on discourse and proposes a triangulatory methodology. As stated previously, DHA is selected as the methodological guideline for this study.

With regard to the historical perspective on discourse, DHA emphasizes that discourse as part of a social practice is intertextualized with other social (non)linguistic practices in history and at present (e.g., Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, 2009; Richardson & Wodak, 2009). Following this line of thought, it contends that discourse should be viewed in reference to its historical source as well as its evolutionary trajectory synchronized with sociocultural and historical-political changes (e.g., Wodak, 1999, p. 188). Accordingly,

it proposes a triangulatory methodological framework for analyzing the discourse-context dynamics diachronically and synchronically in order to minimize partial, biased and/or subjective interpretations of the data, which is in actuality a typical problem with many CDA studies (see Breeze, 2011; Stubbs, 1997). By “triangulatory”, DHA means to “integrate [, in addition to multidisciplinary knowledge and multiple methodological approaches,] texts of as many different genres as possible” (Wodak, 1999, p. 188). In particular, it means to “triangulate knowledge about historical sources and the background of the social and political fields within which discursive events are embedded” (Wodak, 2001, p. 65; Wodak & Fairclough, 2010, p. 255).

To be specific, DHA proposes that discourse should be analyzed in accordance with the four recursive dimensions of its context: 1) the immediate, language or text internal co-context and co-discourse, 2) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses, 3) the extralinguistic social variables and institutional frames of a specific ‘context of situation’, and 4) the broader sociopolitical and historical context, which discursive practices are embedded in and related to (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 93; see also Wodak, 2001, p. 67). By taking the multi-layered context into account, DHA fulfills its three critiques, i.e., “discourse-immanent critique” (conducting text internal analysis), “socio-diagnostic critique” (interpreting discursive events in reference to contextual knowledge and different theories), and more importantly, “future-related prospective critique” (proposing strategies for the improvement of communication) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 88; see also Wodak, 2001, p. 65). As such, it “transcends the pure linguistic dimension and to include more or less systematically the historical, political, sociological, and/or psychological dimension in the analysis and interpretation of [discourse]” (Wodak & Reisigl, 2001, p. 383).

In addition to this macro triangulatory analytical framework, DHA proposes a concrete three-dimensional guideline for analyzing textual meaning and structures. The three dimensions consists of 1) contents or topics (what the text is about), 2) discursive strategies (systematic ways of using language, Wodak & Boukala, 2015, p. 93) and 3) linguistic means (as types) and forms (as tokens) of the realization of topics and discursive strategies (Wodak & Fairclough, 2010, p. 255). Specifically, the analysis moves along three recursive steps: 1) identifying the macro topic as well as its sub-components of a discourse or text, 2) investigating the corresponding discursive

strategy, and 3) examining the macro linguistic type and micro token (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 93; see also Wodak et al., 2009).

When conducting textual analysis, DHA attaches special attention to five discursive strategies. To be specific, the five strategies, alongside five heuristic questions, consist of 1) Nomination or referential strategy (How are people, events and/or actions referred to linguistically?), 2) Predication strategy (What characteristics or qualities are attributed to people, events and/or actions?), 3) Argumentation (What arguments or justifications are employed in discourses or texts), 4) Perspectivization (From which perspectives are nomination, predication and argumentation articulated?), and 5) Modification (Whether and how nomination, predication and argumentation are intensified or mitigated?) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, pp. 93-94).

The historical perspective on discourse and its related triangulatory approach can serve as an appropriate methodology for exploring Native-speakerism in China's ELT. As stated several times previously, Native-speakerism is originated from the colonial past and tangled up with political, economic and cultural factors; it has been encountering discursive and ideological resistance. Moreover, it is context specific and manifests itself differently in different contexts (Holliday, 2005, p. 8; see also Houghton & Rivers, 2013, p. 5). With regard to the perceptions of ELT stakeholders on Native-speakerism, most of the attitudinal studies reviewed in the preceding chapter (see Section 2.2.1) are indicative of its persistence or tenacity among ELT stakeholders; attitudinal changes of a certain degree were also revealed in relation to certain aspects of ELT. However, methodological problems, such as insufficiency in data source, were found with those studies (see Section 2.2.2). In light of the complexity of Native-speakerism, it requires being viewed in reference to the multi-layered social background where it is embedded, particularly the historical-present sociocultural and sociopolitical contexts where it sprouts and evolves. In the meantime, reliable and valid findings on the mental state of ELT stakeholders to do with this ideology requires the triangulation of different types of data collected from diverse sources and through dissimilar methods. In this sense, DHA provides a theoretical and methodological guideline for this study.

Given the above-stated complexity of Native-speakerism, the framework proposed by DHA for analyzing discourse in accordance with multi-layered contextual factors, in

particular the three broad recursive critiques – discourse-immanent critique, socio-diagnostic critique and future-related prospective critique – provides a macro guideline for dissecting discourse in this study. More importantly, it is aligned with the objective of this research, i.e., to locate whether – if so, to what extent – EFL education in China is still affected by Native-speakerism and then propose related measures for solving the possible problem for the construction of a (more) democratic and equitable ELT world (see Section 1.2).

As stated previously, Native-speakerism represents a naturalized Self versus Other politics in ELT. The three parameters proposed by DHA for textual analysis – content, discursive strategy and linguistic realization – should be referenced in dissecting the texts and talks produced by those who are engaged in everyday ELT practice. One of the significant reasons resides in that these parameters, particularly discursive strategy, are themselves “involved in constructing a positive Self and a negative Other presentation” (Wodak & Boukala, 2015, p. 93). In this sense, the micro scheme of DHA for analyzing and interpreting texts also fits in well with this study.

The discussions of CDA and its DHA approach suggest their suitability for providing a theoretical and methodological framework for this study. Nevertheless, there are certain methodological/theoretical shortcomings with this research paradigm. As noted earlier (see Section 2.3.2), many CDA studies fail to take context into account (e.g., Breeze, 2011, p. 514). In the meantime, they tend to draw on available discourses or qualitative data (e.g., Blommaert, 2005) – usually small in size or insufficient in quantity – despite the advocate in this research arena for combining “both qualitative methodologies such as ethnographies ... as well as quantitative ones based on questionnaires and statistics” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 45; see also Fairclough, 1993). Although DHA takes multi-layered contextual factors and enlarges therefore the data size by means of its triangulatory methodology, most DHA studies (e.g., Boukala, 2014; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) seem to have not attempted to utilize quantitative methods. In order to enhance further the reliability and validity of research findings, this study is determined to draw on both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Other triangulation measures, such as the adoption of member check (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 236) in deciphering data, is also adopted to minimize the subjective or partial interpretation of texts, another typical problem of CDA (Breeze, 2011, p. 504). Details of the methodological design for this

study are presented in the following chapter.

### **3.4 Summary**

This chapter delineates the theoretical framework and methodological guideline for this study. It embarks on stating that this study will adopt CDA as a macro theoretical guideline and DHA as a micro methodological approach to explore the current ideological landscape of ELT in China in relation to Native-speakerism (Section 3.1). Section 3.2 elaborates on the theoretical perspective of CDA on the dialectical relationship between discourse and society as well as on its the moral and/or political commitment to social emancipation. In particular, it illustrates the dynamics of discourse, power and ideology. Section 3.3 outlines the historical perspective of DHA on discourse, its triangulatory methodological design, the context-dependent analytical framework and three critiques. At the same time, it illustrates the three-dimensional framework for textual analysis, particularly the five discursive strategies that are suggested to be taken into special account. While describing the theoretical purports of CDA and the methodological guideline of DHA, it justifies their applicability to this study. The application of the theoretical framework and methodological guideline to this study can be seen in the following chapters.

## **Chapter 4 Methodology**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter delineates the methodology for the present research. Following the brief introduction (Section 4.1), Section 4.2 introduces the mixed methods approach and then justifies and describes its application to this study. Research settings are reported in Section 4.3. Section 4.4 provides the demographic information of the three groups of Chinese participants – students, teachers and administrators – who are directly engaged in China's EFL education. Section 4.5 illuminates in detail the research instruments (questionnaires and interviews) and their instrumentation. Followed in Section 4.6 is the description of the administration of these instruments, i.e., the process of data collection. Section 4.7 elaborates on the main strategies or methods for data analysis. The chapter concludes in Section 4.8 with a summary of the major content presented in the preceding sections.

### **4.2 Research design**

This study adopts the mixed methods approach (e.g., Bryman, 2006; Denzin, 2012; Morgan, 1998), which, as a rule,

involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research (Creswell et al., 2003, p. 212).

The principal advantage of this approach rests with its capitalization on the respective strengths of traditionally dichotomized quantitative and qualitative research methods for achieving a profound and comprehensive understanding of the issues in question that neither of the two methods by itself can bring about (e.g., Bryman, 2012, p. 628; see also Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

The adoption of the mixed methods approach follows the triangulatory methodology proposed by DHA and at the same time fills the gap of most DHA studies, which seem to have not attempted to employ quantitative methods (see Section 3.3). It also agrees

with the macro objective of this study and the route to this end. As stated earlier, this study is intended to find out the current ideological landscape of EFL education in China in relation to Native-speakerism by investigating the opinions of Chinese ELT stakeholders on different aspects of ELT. As such, it requires a large pool of different categories of participants, particularly those engaged in everyday ELT practice, as their attitudes can represent the deepest impact of Native-speakerism on China's ELT. Questionnaire survey is thereby adopted because it is time-saving and cost-efficient in gathering data from a large population sample (e.g., Bryman, 2012; Dörnyei, 2007), *inter alia*, reliable or valid data on account of its anonymity (e.g., Muijs, 2004; Richards & Lockhart, 1994). In addition, a well-designed questionnaire can tap into the attitudes of which the respondents may not have been aware (Bryman, 2008, as cited in Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009, p. 6).

Despite these merits, questionnaire survey has its own limitations. One of them resides in its potential impossibility to elicit from the participants comprehensive responses (Bleistein, 2013, p. 57) and in-depth answers (Bryman, 2012, p. 234) to the issues in question. One of the major reasons lies in that questionnaires tend to adopt close-ended questions to explore complicated issues (Brown, 2009, pp. 204-205). Interview is therefore needed because it is conducive for participants to elaborate on their opinions on the issues in question (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 136; see also Strauss & Corbin, 2015), providing data to triangulate, validate and complement those gathered through questionnaire surveys. In this sense, it is necessary to include interview as an instrument in this study, as it helps to arrive at a deeper insight into the mentality of Chinese ELT stakeholders regarding Native-speakerism.

A sequential mixed methods approach is followed, with questionnaire surveys first administered to a large number of students and teachers and then with interviews conducted with administrators as well as a certain number of students and teachers sampled on a voluntary basis from those participating in the questionnaire surveys. It is noted that student interviewees attended written interviews (Sandvil et al., 1993, p. 325), i.e., providing answers in written form to a list of questions. The teachers and administrators participated in conventional semi-structured individual oral interviews. Presented in the following sections is the detailed information on research settings, participants, instruments, procedures of data collection, and data analysis methods.

### 4.3 Settings

This study was conducted at six universities located in four cities of a province in North China. They are a major component of higher education of this province. Out of ethical considerations, the province and universities are kept in anonymity.

In terms of the integrated economic development level, this province can be said to rank in the middle among the 31 provinces and municipalities in mainland China<sup>[6]</sup>. Of the six universities, one is a ‘211 Project university’ and therefore can be regarded as a representative of prestigious universities in China<sup>[7]</sup>. The five others also enjoy a high social reputation in this province and beyond. Observed from annual national university rankings in the past few years, such as the those conducted by Shulian Wu, a scholar of Wuhan University, China, it can be said that five universities represent to a great degree many second-level universities in China. Moreover, the six universities differ in disciplinary background, ranging from science and engineering, teacher education to economics. This adds more weight to their representativeness.

As with most universities in China, the six universities all offer a two-year College English (CE) program, i.e., an EFL course for non-English-major undergraduates in China (see also Section 1.4.3). They adopt textbooks that are widely adopted in China. Meanwhile, they have been making efforts to improve their CE programs in accordance with the regulations on CE education issued by the Chinese MOE, such as College English Course Requirement (2007). For instance, every year, they send their CE teachers to attend teacher education programs organized by Inner Circle universities and/or higher educational institutes in China. Moreover, they set up explicit criteria on the English proficiency that their students are expected to achieve. When data for this study were collected, five of the universities still adhered to the popular regulation at many Chinese universities that non-English-major undergraduate students must pass

---

<sup>[6]</sup> This judgement is made in reference to the online information on annual gross national product (GDP) rankings of 31 provinces in China (e.g., <http://he.people.com.cn/n2/2017/0314/c192235-29851779.html>) and on the rankings of annual per capita disposable income (e.g., <http://hebei.sina.com.cn/news/m/2017-03-08/detail-ifycaafp2257509.shtml>).

<sup>[7]</sup> In 1995, the Chinese government launched a project, i.e., building up 100 world known universities in the 21st century. Altogether, 112 top universities were selected as members of this project and therefore are called ‘211 Project University’. However, the term, ‘211 Project’, may lose its charm with the initiation of a new top university construction project launched by Chinese government in 2017.



CET-4 before being eligible for the awarding of a Bachelor's degree. It is noted that the Chinese MOE rates the CE program of one of the six universities as a national teaching model. In reference to their students' CET-4 scores in the past few years, the CE programs of four other universities can be rated at a medium level in China; the program of one university ranks below the average level. Considering all these factors, the CE programs of the six universities can represent to a great degree CE education in China. In addition, their representativeness can be observed from the make-up of their CE teachers in respect of gender, academic background and professional rank (see Wang & Wang, 2011). The variations of the universities and their CE programs contribute to the triangulation of data sources.

#### **4.4 Participants**

Altogether, 926 EFL stakeholders from the six universities participated in this study, including 850 non-English-major undergraduate students, 68 CE teachers and eight CE program administrators. They were sampled in line with purposive sampling principle in order to achieve maximum variation of the participants (Maxwell, 1997, 2013), though the convenient and snowball sampling strategies (Bryman, 2012, p. 202) were also adopted to ensure access to target participants. The inclusion of different categories of participants and the adoption of different sampling strategies are expected to ensure the triangulation in participant and therefore data source. In addition, all the participants are Chinese, with *Putonghua*, i.e., Mandarin Chinese, as their everyday language. Both the students and teachers participated in questionnaire surveys. Of them, 26 students and 14 teachers attended the follow-up interviews. The attitudes of the administrators in relation to Native-speakerism were investigated merely through interviews.

##### Participants in questionnaire surveys

The 850 student participants were all sophomores aged at about 20. When participating in the survey, they had received formal EFL education at school for more than 11 years, including CE education for almost one and a half years. To make them maximally represent the second-year non-English-major undergraduate students, two factors, gender and disciplinary area, were given special attention in the sampling process. Statistical calculation indicates the make-up of the 817 students who provided valid

responses: engineering (155; 19.0%), science (206; 25.2%), social sciences (54; 6.6%) humanities (175; 21.4%) and business (227; 27.8%). In terms of gender, 387 (47.4%) are males and 430 (52.6%) are females. Except the 54 students of social sciences who came from one university, all of the students were dispersed almost evenly in number among the six universities. The demographic information of the students is summarized in the following table.

Table 4.1 Gender, discipline distribution of student participants (Questionnaire survey)

	Engineering		Science		Social Sciences		Humanities		Business		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	125	15.3	138	16.9	22	2.7	32	3.9	70	8.6	387	47.4
Female	30	3.7	68	8.3	32	3.9	143	17.5	157	19.2	430	52.6
Total	155	19.0	206	25.2	54	6.6	175	21.4	227	27.8	817	100

To achieve maximum variation (Maxwell, 1997, 2013) and then high representativeness, three variables, gender, academic degree and professional rank, were taken into account in sampling teacher participants. Of the 68 CE teachers, 18 came from one of the six university and 10 were from each of the other five. In terms of gender, 22 (32.4%) are males and 46 (67.6%) are females. When participating in the survey, two (2.9%) held doctoral degrees, 63 (92.6%) Master's and 3 (4.4%) Bachelor's. The academic degrees are dispersed in different areas, including applied linguistics, TESOL, translation, linguistics or English literature. Their professional ranks also varied, with two (2.9%) being professors, 12 (17.6%) associate professors, 48 (70.6%) lecturers and six (8.8%) teaching assistants. Table 4.2 presents the demographic information of those teachers.

Table 4.2 Gender, academic degree and professional rank of teacher participants (Questionnaire survey)

	PhD		MA		BA		Prof		Associate Prof		Lecturer		Teaching assistant		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	0	0.0	21	30.9	1	1.5	0	0.0	3	4.4	16	23.5	3	4.4	22	32.4
Female	2	2.9	42	1.8	2	2.9	2	2.9	9	13.2	32	7.1	3	4.4	46	67.6
Total	2	2.9	63	92.6	3	4.4	2	2.9	12	17.6	48	70.6	6	8.8	68	100

### Participants in interviews

Participants in interviews comprise 26 students, 14 teachers and the eight administrators. The students and teachers were sampled on a voluntary basis from those participating in the questionnaire surveys. As noted earlier (see Section 4.2), the administrators only attended interviews.

The 26 students were from the six universities and distributed in five disciplinary areas. Of them, six (23.1%) came from one of the six universities and four (15.4%) from each of the other five. Six (23.1%) came from each of the three disciplinary areas, i.e., engineering, science and humanities; five (19.2%) majored in business and the three others (11.5%) specialized in social sciences. As regards gender, 15 (57.7%) are males and 11 (42.3%) are females. In this sense, the 26 interviewees represent to a great degree the students who participated in the questionnaire survey. Summarized in Table 4.3 is the demography of the 26 student interviewees.

Table 4.3 Gender, discipline distribution of student participants (Interview)

	Engineering		Science		Social Sciences		Humanities		Business		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	4	15.4	4	15.4	3	11.5	2	7.7	3	11.5	16	61.5
Female	2	7.7	2	7.7	0	0.0	4	15.4	2	7.7	10	38.5
Total	6	23.1	6	23.1	3	11.5	6	23.1	5	19.2	26	100

Of the 14 teacher interviewees, four (32.4%) came from one of the six universities, and two (14.3%) from each of the other five. Four (32.4%) are males and 10 (67.6%) are females. One (7.1%) held a doctoral degree in applied linguistics and the 13 (92.6%) others all held Master's degrees in disciplinary areas, including applied linguistics, TESOL, translation, linguistics or English literature. With regard to professional rank, one participant (7.1%) was a professor, six (17.6%) associate professors, five (37.5%) lecturers and the remaining two (14.3%) teaching assistants. In view of the diverse make-up of these teacher interviewees in gender, academic degree, professional rank, they represent to a certain degree the 68 teacher participants in the questionnaire survey

(see Table 4.2). Presented in Table 4.4 is the demographic information of the 14 teachers.

Table 4.4 Gender, academic degree and professional rank of teacher participants (Interview)

	PhD		MA		Prof		Associate Prof		Lecturer		Teaching Assistant		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	0	0.0	4	28.6	0	0.0	2	14.3	2	14.3	0	0.0	4	28.6
Female	1	7.1	9	64.3	1	7.1	4	28.6	3	21.4	2	14.3	10	71.4
Total	1	7.1	13	92.9	1	7.1	6	42.9	5	35.7	2	14.3	14	100

Of the eight CE program administrators, four came from two universities, with two from each whereas each of the other four administrators came from each of the other universities. When participating in this study, one of them served as the dean while the others worked as the vice dean of the School of Foreign Languages of their respective universities. In addition to management, they were engaged in the development of CE curricula and everyday classroom teaching. Of them, three (37.5%) are males and five (62.5%) females. In addition, two (25%) held the doctoral degree in applied linguistics and the other six (75%) all held the Master's in areas of applied linguistics, TESOL, linguistics, translation or English literature. They were divided equally in professional rank, with four (50%) holding the full professorship vis-à-vis the other four (50%) being associated professors. Table 4.5 synthesizes their demographic information.

Table 4.5 Gender, academic qualification, professional rank and job position of administrator participants (Interview)

	PhD		MA		Prof		Associate Prof		Dean		Vice Dean		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	1	12.5	2	25.0	2	37.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	3	37.5
Female	1	12.5	4	50.0	2	25.0	3	37.5	0	0.0	5	62.5	5	62.5
Total	2	25.0	6	75.0	4	62.5	4	37.5	1	12.5	7	87.5	8	100

## 4.5 Instruments

As stated previously (see Section 4.2), this study intends to employ two categories of

data collection instruments – two questionnaires (see Appendix 1B and Appendix 2B) and two types of interviews (see Appendices 3-5). The questionnaires are designed for investigating the overall attitudinal tendency of the students and teachers in relation to Native-speakerism whereas the interview questions are formulated to probe into the in-depth viewpoints of the three stakeholder groups on this chauvinistic ideology.

### Questionnaires

Of the two questionnaires, the one for students is composed of three sections: cognitive attitude, learning orientation and background information. The first section is intended to explore the general viewpoints of the students on the four aspects of ELT in relation to Native-speakerism. Precisely, it consists of 21 five-point Likert scale statements, which fall into five multi-item scales concerning issues to do with English language varieties (Item 1-4), English language norms (Item 5-8), teaching approaches (Item 9-12), cultural orientations of ELT (Item 13-16) and English language teachers (Item 17-21). The second section includes five semi-open-ended multi-choice questions, which are aimed at locating the students' learning orientations or behavioral tendencies in scenarios where different types of teachers, English language varieties, accents, textbooks and teaching approaches are available for choice. In addition to making choices, they are asked to state reasons. The third section consists of six items. They are targeted at collecting the demographic information on student participants, which is expected to be resorted to in making intra-group comparisons in attitude.

The questionnaire for teachers includes four sections. Except the first section that focuses on teachers' everyday teaching practices <sup>[8]</sup>, the other three sections parallel those in the questionnaire for students. Precisely, the second section consists of 16 five-point Likert scale statements, which are also aimed at measuring teachers' general viewpoints on the four aspects of ELT. The items fall into four multi-item scales to do with English language varieties (Items 11, 12, 13 and 17), English language teachers (Items 14, 16, 18 and 26), cultural orientations of ELT (Items 15, 22, 24 and 25) and teaching approaches (Items 19, 20, 21, 23) respectively. The third section is composed of five semi-open-ended multi-choice questions, similar to those for students but

---

<sup>[8]</sup> The design of this section was intended to collect data for assessing whether teachers' daily teaching practices agree with their general viewpoints and teaching orientations.

targeted at finding out teachers' orientations in teaching practice. The fourth section comprises six items, which are intended to gather demographic information on teachers.

Despite the similarities between these paralleling sections, differences in number and wording exist among the question items. Another obvious difference rests with the organization or presentation of the Likert scale items. In the questionnaire for students, items of the same multi-item scale are presented in a block. However, items of different scales are intermingled in the questionnaire for teachers. It is noted that the choice of "block presentation" (Wegener & Fabrigar, 2004) in the former was made in response to student participants' request after the first pilot study.

Regarding the content and structure of the two questionnaires, several points need to be explicated. The use of Likert scale question items consists in that they have been proved effective for investigating attitudes. As stated above, the items are dispersed in different multi-item scales. Each scale is designed to explore the perceptions of ELT stakeholders on the traditional pro-nativeness ideology in each of the four respects of ELT, namely, the superiority of NESTs, Inner Circle English, Inner Circle culture or Inner Circle to the nonnative counterparts. Items of each scale are designed in line with predominant perspectives from which the pro-nativeness ideology is articulated. For instance, the items within the scale on the NESTs and NNESTs issue are constructed on the popular viewpoints that NESTs possess superior linguacultural competence in English and/or sophisticated instructional skills. To guarantee reliability of each multi-item scale, 4-5 items are included. The inclusion of the semi-open multiple-choice questions was intended to triangulate the Likert scale questions. In particular, it is out of the consideration that the general attitudes expressed by ELT stakeholders on ELT may not agree with their own learning/teaching orientations or tendencies. For instance, the low English proficiency of an English learner may reduce his/her effort to pursue Inner Circle English, though s/he regards it as StE. In this sense, an agreement in theme was kept between each multi-item scale, each semi-opened multiple-choice question and each research question. Considering that individual factors of the target population may exert influence on their viewpoints, related question items were designed to gather the demographic information for making intra-group comparisons in attitude. In order to make participants feel it easy to answer the question items, reduce their psychological burdens and then collect valid data, close-ended question items are placed before the

open-ended ones and questions on personal information are put at the end of the questionnaire (Dörnyei, 2007, pp. 111-112).

In formulating each question item, reference was made to literature on cultural politics in ELT (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2006, 2012), particularly the questionnaires utilized in the attitudinal studies reviewed (e.g., Matsuda, 2003b; Timmis, 2002). In order to make the questionnaires understandable to participants and then collect reliable and valid data, all of the question items were written in Chinese, the mother tongue of the target participants. Efforts were also made to use simple and unambiguous words and avoid negative constructions (see Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009).

When the final versions of the two questionnaires were decided, I translated them into English for potential use with participants from related language backgrounds in the future. A professional translator was hired to check the equivalence of the two versions.

The development of the questionnaires (Chinese version) for students and teachers are also based on two pilot studies, initial piloting and final piloting (Dörnyei, 2007; see also Mackey & Gass, 2005), both of which were conducted in October 2014. For the initial piloting, the two sets of questionnaires were sent to two professors with experiences in designing questionnaires for a review with a focus on content validity. In the meantime, five non-English-major undergraduate students and three CE teachers were asked to answer the questionnaires respectively in order to measure their understandings of the question items and the length of time they would spend in completing the whole questionnaires and more importantly to seek their suggestions on the modification of the question items.

The initial pilot study suggests that it took about 35-40 minutes for the students and the teachers to complete their respective questionnaires, an acceptable time length according to Dörnyei (2007). Regarding the questionnaire for students, the two professors questioned the appropriateness of the Likert-scale items within the scale on the cultural orientations of ELT as well as the preciseness of many other items. The five students suggested that the Likert scale items of each scale be presented in a block rather than being intermingled with items of other scales, claiming that this may reduce chance of confusion. As for the questionnaire for teachers, the two professors and three

teachers were concerned about the wording of some Likert scale items. In reference to their suggestions, the questionnaires were modified before being put into final piloting.

During the final piloting of the questionnaire for students, 120 second-year non-English-major students were sampled from one of the six universities in accordance with the purposive sampling principle (Maxwell, 1997, 2013). The students were equal in number in respect of their specializations – engineering, science, business, and social sciences and humanities. With the students assembled in a large classroom, I introduced to them the research project and assured them of the confidentiality of their personal information before distributing the questionnaires. Meanwhile, I made it explicit that they are not obliged for answering the questionnaire. In order to make them answer the questionnaire seriously, no information was mentioned that it is a pilot study (see Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009).

It took about 40 minutes for the students to complete the questionnaires. The 120 questionnaires returned were all found valid. The reliability test of the questionnaire items was conducted with SPSS 20.0, with attention attached to the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the 21 five-point Likert scale items as a whole and that for each multi-item scale. According to Dörnyei (2007), a group of statements or a multi-item scale can be considered consistent internally, if the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is close to or above 0.60. The Alpha value for all the 21 Likert scale items equals 0.867, and the values for different scales are 0.843 (English language varieties; Items 1-4), 0.836 (English language norms; Items 5-8), 0.876 (teaching approaches; Items 9-12), and 0.761 (cultural orientations; Items 13-16), and 0.814 (English language teachers; Items 17-21). Regarding the semi-opened multiple-choice questions, no answer was selected by almost all the participants. The data collected is of statistical significance (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009, p. 56). All these findings suggest the reliability of the questionnaire.

The final piloting of the questionnaire for teachers involves 15 CE teachers sampled from three of the six universities by means of a snowball sampling plus purposive sampling strategy (Bryman, 2012, p. 202). These teachers include three males and 12 females. They were different in academic qualification (one holding a doctoral degree and the others Master's) and professional rank (one professor, five associated professors, seven lecturers and two teaching assistants). In this sense, they can serve as



representatives of the target teacher population.

Data collected were processed in the same way as those gathered from the students. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the 16 five-point Likert scale statements reaches 0.80. The value for each multi-item scale is 0.644 (English language varieties; Items 11, 12, 13 and 17), 0.645 (English language teachers; Items 14, 16, 18 and 26), 0.672 (cultural orientations; Items 15, 22, 24 and 25) and 0.812 (teaching approaches; Items 19, 20, 21 and 23). Meanwhile, no answer to each the semi-opened multiple-choice questions was chosen by almost all the teacher participants. As such, the questionnaires for teachers can be deemed reliable for collecting data without further revision.

### Interviews

Three sets of interview questions were designed for students, teachers and administrators respectively in order to acquire profound knowledge of their attitudes toward Native-speakerism, particularly their justifications for the expressed attitudes and to explore their awareness of the inequality in ELT (re)produced by this chauvinistic ideology. The questions for students consist of 10 items, for teachers 13, and for administrators 15 (see Appendices 3-5). In fact, the items are the extension of those in questionnaires. They were constructed in reference to the preliminary analysis of the data collected through the questionnaire surveys as well as the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 (e.g., Li, 2009; Moussu, 2006b). The question items were all written in Chinese. As with translating the questionnaires, an English version of interview questions was produced with the help of the professional translator.

During constructing interview questions, suggestions were constantly solicited from two scholars with relevant experiences. In order to find out whether the questions can elicit responses suitable for this study, I conducted pilot interviews with five students, three teachers, and two administrators in November 2014. The students and teachers were selected from those who had participated in the final piloting of the questionnaires. The five students, three males and two females, specialized respectively in engineering, sciences, business, social sciences and humanities. The three teachers are all females; all held the Master's degree in TESOL; two were associated professors and one was a lecturer. In addition, two women administrators were interviewed. They came from two

of the six universities, holding Master's degree in applied Linguistics and the associate professorship. The interviews were conducted in *Putonghua* and audio-recorded with the permissions of the interviewees. The average time length of the interviews for students was about 25 minutes, for teachers about 45 minutes, and for administrators around 90 minutes. In conducting the interviews, I attached special attention to the oft-mentioned ethical issues in interview, such as the imbalanced power relations within and beyond the interview settings (e.g., Tillmann-Healy, 2003) and exerted myself to create an equitable and friendly atmosphere for the interviewees, listening to them carefully and never forcing my perspectives on them. In processing the data, I tried to maintain a neutral position to avoid the interference of my priori convictions. The interpretation of the interview transcripts was also checked with the interviewees (see Bryman, 2012, p. 391). The analysis of the data collected from the teachers and administrators indicates that the suitability of the interview questions. Nevertheless, data gathered from the students did not display rich information. The five students explained that they felt shy during the interview and preferred to answer the questions in written form because it could make them feel more relaxed and allow them more time to reflect on the questions. As stated previously, written interview (Sandvil et al., 1993, p. 325) was decided to be conducted with them upon their requirement.

#### **4.6 Data collection**

Data were collected in two phases. In November 2014, the questionnaire surveys and interviews were administered to the students and teachers. In May 2015, interviews were conducted with the administrators. Notably, questionnaires of the Chinese version were used and interviews were conducted by the researcher in Chinese. As with the conducts in the final pilot study, special attention was attached to the ethical issues in administering the questionnaire surveys and interviews.

Before the questionnaire survey of the 850 students, consent had been obtained from the dean of School of Foreign Languages of each of the six universities to conducting the survey of the non-English-major students in their CE class, which is a strategy for guaranteeing a high response rate (see Bitchener, 2009). I went to the CE classes of three universities to collect data. As for the other three universities, the questionnaire

copies were mailed to the deans, who had them completed in CE class. After the questionnaire survey, 26 students were chosen to attend the follow-up written interview. The questions were sent to them via email, who provided answers in Chinese.

Alongside collecting data from students, the questionnaire survey and interviews were administered to the 68 teachers. The copies of the questionnaire were mailed to them, who returned the completed questionnaires in about one week. After that, 14 teachers were invited to attend interviews on a voluntary basis. The interviews with the four teachers from the one of the six universities were conducted in my office. With the 10 others, interviews were conducted on telephone at their convenience. Each interview lasted about 35-40 minutes and was audio-taped with the permission of the interviewee.

Likewise, interviews with the eight administrators were conducted on telephone at their convenience with the duration averaged at about 80 minutes. The interviews were audio-taped, as were done with the teachers.

#### **4.7 Data analysis**

With the data collected, 817 of the 850 questionnaires returned by the students and all of the 68 questionnaires collected from the teachers were found valid, though many students and teachers did not provide demographic information. Two graduate students were hired to enter the quantitative data in Excel spreadsheets independently and cross-examinations were made in cases of discrepancy. Qualitative data gathered through the interviews were transcribed according to the denaturalized method, which removes the sociocultural features in the speech of the interviewees, such as laughter, gestures (see Davidson, 2009). In reference to research questions and the traditional Self versus Other ideology in ELT, I divided the transcripts into broad thematic groups; those classified were then categorized into sub-thematic cohorts, which were further assorted into smaller thematic clusters. During this process, I searched for the high-frequency remarks or comments that either support or counter Native-speakerism. Following the rule of “*back translation*” (Birbili, 2000, as cited in Filep, 2009), I translated into English these typical texts with the help of the professional translator hired for this

study<sup>[9]</sup>. Detailed data analysis was then conducted by data type and research question. In presenting findings, the participants are represented by codes in order to keep their anonymity<sup>[10]</sup>.

Prior to dissecting the quantitative data, the internal consistency test of the Likert scale statements was conducted with SPSS 20.0. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the 21 Likert-scale items in the questionnaire for students reaches 0.934. The alpha values for different scales amount to 0.869 (English language varieties; Items 1-4), 0.841 (English language norms; Items 5-8), 0.845 (teaching approaches; Items 9-12), and 0.742 (cultural orientations; Items 13-16) and 0.813 (English language teachers; Items 17-21). Regarding the 16 Liker-scale items for teachers, Item 22 was deleted according to the rule of "alpha if item deleted" (Doiz et al., 2014, p. 349). The reliability coefficient for the other 15 items reaches 0.828; the Alpha values for the four multi-item scales arrive at 0.720 (English language varieties; Items 11, 12, 13 and 17), 0.606 (English language teachers; Items 14, 16, 18 and 26), 0.623 (cultural orientations; Items 15, 24 and 25) and 0.860 (teaching approaches; Items 19, 20, 21 and 23). As for the semi-open multiple-choice questions in the two questionnaires, no choice was found selected by almost all participants, suggesting therefore the statistical significance of the data<sup>[11]</sup>. All these findings suggest the reliability of the quantitative data.

In analyzing the data collected from the Likert scale questions, the mean, percentage and frequency of each multi-item scale were calculated to assess the overall attitudinal tendency of each of the two participant groups – students and teachers – regarding Native-speakerism that the scale was intended to explore. Attention was also attached to the statistical values of individual items within each scale in order to determine their

---

<sup>[9]</sup> The transcript of the interviews with 14 teachers reaches 43538 words and the one for the eight administrators includes 40347 words. The written interviews with the 26 students produced 15353 words. After screening off the segments not directly related to the issue in question, I produced a 60245-word text. Further sorting out the data in line with the Self versus Other theme reduces the text to 35820 words. Finally, a 15750-word text was decided to be used in this study and then translated into English.

<sup>[10]</sup> Codes, such as S-1 and T-2, represent the students and teachers participating in the questionnaire surveys; those, such as SI-1, TI-2 and A-3, stand for the students, teachers and administrators attending the interviews. The number refers to the sequence in which data from the participants were processed.

<sup>[11]</sup> This is also true of the ten multiple-choice questions on teachers' everyday teaching practice in the questionnaire for teachers. However, results in relation to these items will not be reported in this thesis due to the lack of comparable data gathered from the students and administrators.

contribution to the overall attitudinal tendency. It is noted the mean for each scale and item was measured by One-sample t-test. Following the descriptive analysis of each scale, an Independent Samples t-test was conducted to explore the mean difference between the two participant groups. In the meantime, the calculation of effect size in the line with Cohen's d was conducted in order to assess the magnitude of the difference. The assessment followed Cohen's criteria that propose 0.2, 0.5 and 0.8 as the numeric representation of small, medium and large effects respectively.

Regarding the data collected through the multiple-choice questions, frequency and percentage were calculated to judge the overall learning/teaching propensity of the students and teachers in scenarios where different types of teachers, English language varieties, English accents, textbooks and teaching approaches are available for choice. Comparisons in percentage were also made between the two participant groups to assess which group were (more) inclined to fall into the pro-nativeness mentality. It is noted that statistical analysis serves as one of the strategies for dealing with qualitative data in order to provide statistics for measuring the overall attitudinal tendencies of each participant group and conducting intergroup comparisons statistically.

However, the three-dimensional framework proposed by DHA for text analysis (see Section 3.3) was mainly followed in analyzing the qualitative data, particularly the translated texts. The search for the contents or topics of the texts were put in a priori position. In doing so, reference was made to five discursive strategies – nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization and modification (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, pp. 93-94). Attention was also attached to linguistic forms that realize the topics and discursive strategies (Wodak & Fairclough, 2010, p. 255). These three analytical steps moved recursively, referencing at the same time the sociocultural and historical-political contexts surrounding China's ELT. Concrete operations can be seen from the analysis of the following excerpt.

NESTs have received *Western education philosophies* since babyhood. In general, they are open-minded and active; they encourage students to challenge teachers, challenge authority; they believe that every student has his shining points and do not assess students according to their exam scores. *They have more merits* ... I've visited several American universities. Even the layout of desks and chairs in classroom is *different* from that of China. They emphasize freedom and critical thinking. NESTs from that

kind of context are *inevitably better* than our Chinese [EFL] teachers. (A-3; emphasis added)

A brief look at this excerpt can reveal its macro topic, namely, A-3 made a comparison of NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers in pedagogical capability, with merits granted to the former. I categorized it into the thematic cohort, i.e., pedagogical capability of NESTs versus NNESTs (see Section 5.2.2). Then, I conducted a detailed analysis of its content to probe into her attitude toward these two categories of teachers, focusing on how her attitude is represented by the discursive strategies and linguistic forms. Apparently, she described NESTs as qualified teachers with professional characteristics (predication), such as being “*open-minded and active*” (linguistic form). She claimed that the superiority of NESTs in this regard stems from their educational experiences, i.e., “*having received Western education philosophies since babyhood*” (argumentation). She move further to justify her viewpoint on the superiority of Western education and NESTs by resorting to her personal experiences – a common strategy for a person to legitimize his/her standpoint (Reyes, 2011) – of visiting several American universities, such as “*the layout of the desks and chairs in classroom*” (argumentation). This argument is developed from the perspective that specific sociocultural and education experiences cultivates specific habitus (Bourdieu, 1989) (perspectivization). Observed from her statements, it is evident that she polarized NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers, granting honors to NESTs and Inner Circle education culture. The unmodified predicates in her arguments, such as “*they are*”, add strength to her belief (modification). It is further strengthened by the paralleled speech, “*they are ... they encourage ... they believe ...*” (rhetorical device) as well as the words with absolute meanings, such as “*inevitably*” (linguistic forms). When analyzing the semantic meaning of the text, I moved between this text and the “order of discourse” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 3) in ELT that advocates the NS fallacy (Phillipson, 1992, p.185). It was found that the Self versus Other ideology underlying her arguments resonates with the Native-speakerist ideology that NESTs are pedagogically superior because Western culture produces the ideals of ELT methodology (Holliday, 2005, p. 6). In addition, I evaluated her stance from a historical perspective in reference to the pro-NESTs tradition in China’s ELT and the historical-present hegemony of Inner Circle countries, concluding that it is product of power. As with this excerpt, all the texts were dissected in accordance to this three dimensional framework. The analysis is also text specific, with attention attached to

particular discursive strategies and linguistic realizations. This is evident from the exemplifying excerpts reported in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8.

When analyzing the texts, I exerted myself to keep a neutral stance as had been done during the final pilot study (see section 4.5), attempting to minimize the interference of my priori ideological convictions about Native-speakerism on my interpretation of the data, a problem of which CDA is often accused (e.g., Schegloff, 1997; Slembrouck, 2001). The analysis of texts moved back and forth between the texts and their situational, institutional and socio-historical contexts. The principle of triangulation was also followed. For many discourse excerpts, cross-analysis were conducted between me and my supervisor; interpretations were checked with the interviewees when it is possible.

#### **4.8 Summary**

This chapter describes the methodological design for this study. It starts with introducing the mixed methods approach and presenting rationales for its application to this study in reference to the methodological shortcoming of DHA and the objective of this study and the related route to this end. Then, it delineates the research setting (six universities in a province in North China), the make-up of the participants (students, teachers and administrators) and the concrete sampling practices. Followed is the description of research instruments (questionnaires and interviews) and their instrumentations. How data were collected and analyzed is then reported respectively. Presented and discussed in the following chapters are the results of data analysis in relation to the five research questions of this study (see Section 1.3).

## **Chapter 5 Attitudes toward English Language Teachers from Different L1 Backgrounds**

### **5.1 Introduction**

From Chapter 5 to Chapter 8, this thesis presents and discusses the findings about the viewpoints of the three groups of participants – students, teachers and administrators – on the four interweaved thematic aspects of ELT to do with English language teachers, English language varieties, cultural orientations, and teaching approaches respectively. This chapter deals with Research Question 1, namely, the attitudes held by the three stakeholder groups toward English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds. Meanwhile, it explores the intergroup attitudinal (dis)similarities, therefore answering in part Research Question 5 (see Section 1.3).

The whole chapter comprises four sections. Following the general introduction (Section 5.1), Section 5.2 presents the findings on the perceptions of the three participant groups regarding the professional quality of NESTs vis-à-vis NNESTs, inter alia, Chinese EFL teachers. By professional quality, it refers, in this study, to linguacultural competence in English and pedagogical capability (see Richards, 1998; Shulman, 1987). Section 5.3 deals with the criteria that the participants expected to be followed in hiring foreign teachers of English. Section 5.4 concentrates on their opinions about the ideal teacher from whom to learn English. Followed in Section 5.5 is the analysis of their viewpoints on the inequalities between NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers in workplaces. In discussing data appertaining to each of these three issues, intergroup (dis)similarities in attitude were compared. This chapter concludes in Section 5.6 with a discussion and summary of the major findings presented in the preceding sections.

### **5.2 Perceived professional qualities of NESTs versus NNESTs**

As stated above, this section deals with the viewpoints of the three participant groups on the professional quality of NESTs and NNESTs. Presented as follows are the results that are obtained though analyzing related data.



### 5.2.1 Linguacultural competence

Of the four Likert scale items (Items 17-20) on the professional quality of NESTs and NNESTs, inter alia, Chinese EFL teachers in the questionnaire for students, three focus on their perceptions of the linguacultural competence of these two types of teachers.

Table 5.1 presents the data in statistics collected from the student participants through these three items. Observed from the statistical information, a pro-nativeness attitude prevailed among the students. This is evident from the average mean for the whole question cluster ( $3.48 \pm 0.925$ ). Of the mean values for individual questions, even the lowest one reaches 3.38 (1.138) (Item 18). This attitudinal tendency is also apparent in percentile distribution. Overall, more than half of the participants (53.1%) identified with the linguacultural superiority of NESTs. Regarding individual items, 60.2% of the students expressed “agreement” and “strong agreement” on that NESTs know more about the pragmatic rules of the English language (Item 20). The ratio for each of the other items approximates 50%. By contrast, only an average of 13.4% of the students displayed (strong) disagreement on the linguacultural superiority of NESTs. It is noted that one third (33.4%) of the students chose the “Not sure” answer.

Table 5.1 Student participants’ attitudes toward the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers in English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 17. Compared with that of most Chinese English language teachers, the English language of NESTs is of higher standard.	4.0%	13.7%	32.7%	32.3%	17.3%	3.45	1.054
Item 18. Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, NESTs know more about the culture underlying the English language.	7.5%	13.5%	29.9%	32.2%	17.0%	3.38	1.138
Item 20. Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, NESTs know more about the pragmatic rules about the English language.	4.3%	12.4%	22.5%	40.0%	20.2%	3.60	1.072
<b>Total</b>	2.8%	10.6%	33.4%	42.0%	11.1%	3.48	.925

Notes: N = 817; NESTs = native English speaker teachers; SD = standard deviation

The viewpoints of the teacher participants on this issue are also observable from their responses to three Likert scale questions. As with the students, the teacher group as an entirety identified with the superiority of NESTs. This is evident from the statistics summarized in the following table.

Table 5.2 Teacher participants' attitudes toward the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus NNESTs in English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 14. Compared with NESTs, most English language teachers from ESL countries have heavy accents.	2.9%	4.4%	45.6%	32.4%	14.7%	3.51	0.906
Item 16. Compared with NNESTs, NESTs can demonstrate to students the authentic culture of English speaking countries.	0.0%	11.7%	22.1%	39.7%	26.5%	3.81	0.966
Item 26. Compared with NNESTs, NESTs can demonstrate to students Standard English.	1.5%	8.8%	26.5%	29.4%	33.8%	3.85	1.040
<b>Total</b>	1.5%	4.4%	27.9%	50.0%	16.2%	3.75	0.835

Notes: N = 68; ESL = English as a second language; NESTs = native English speaker teachers; NNESTs = native English speaker teachers; SD = standard deviation

According to the statistical information, the average mean for the three Likert scale items reaches 3.75(0.835) and even the lowest one arrives at 3.51(0.906) (Item 14); the average total percentage equals (66.2%). As regards individual items, more than 60% of the participants expressed (strong) agreement on NESTs' knowledge about the culture underpinning the English language (Item 16) and on their capability to supply StE (Item 26). In terms of accent, about half of the participants (47.1%) expressed a negative opinion on English language teachers from Outer Circle countries (Item 14). This implies conversely a positive attitude toward NESTs in this regard. By contrast, only an average of 5.9% of the teachers took an opposite stance on the linguacultural superiority of NESTs. As with the student group, a certain percent (27.9%) of teachers selected the "Not sure" answer.

Despite the similarity in attitudinal tendency between these two participant groups, the difference in average mean seems to show they differed in degree of agreement on the

superiority of NESTs' linguacultural competence in English. This is confirmed by the results of the Independent Samples t-test reported in Table 5.3. According to the statistics, the teacher group were more supportive of NESTs ( $t(883) = 2.331, p < 0.05$ ) than the students, but the difference is not great ( $d = 0.31$ ).

Table 5.3 Independent Samples t-test of the attitudes of students and teachers toward the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus NNESTs in English

Students (N = 817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.48	0.925	3.75	0.835	2.331	883	0.02	0.27	0.31

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen's d

The pro-nativeness attitude among the students and teachers becomes more evident with the analysis of the qualitative data. When answering the question on the capability of these two categories of teachers to provide authentic linguacultural knowledge in English (Question Item 3), 23 (88.5%) of the 26 student interviewees granted merits to NESTs while denigrating the nonnative counterparts. In the meantime, they articulated their opinions affirmatively as if this perceived difference between these two groups of teachers were natural or factual. Both can be observed from the content of their remarks, particularly the discursive strategies and linguistic forms they adopted to elaborate on their stance. For instance,

*NESTs have a deeper understanding of the English language and use English more fluently; they know more about English culture, more widely and comprehensively; they are able to let students experience English culture while experiencing the English language, and thus give students a sense as if they were in natural English environment. In contrast, Chinese EFL teachers are limited in terms of the knowledge and comprehension of English language and culture. (SI-25; Emphasis added)*

In this excerpt, SI-25 argued forcefully that NESTs are linguaculturally more competent than Chinese EFL teachers. The support of the former is apparent from the competence she assigned to NESTs in the paralleled comparative construction, "*NESTs have ... they know ... they are able to ...*". It is also evident from the derogatory word, "*limited*" she used to describe the competence of Chinese EFL teachers. The strength of her stance manifests explicitly not only in the words and expressions but also in the paralleled

structure, as parallelism usually demonstrates the strong feeling of writers and speakers through the rhythmical flow of series of ideas (see Kaplan, 1967). More importantly, it is realized by the unmodified predicates. With all these discursive strategies and the linguistic forms thereof, SI-25 polarized NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers, which resonates to a great degree with the traditional Self versus Other dichotomy in ELT.

The polarization is also represented in the responses provided by 13 of the 14 teacher interviewees to Question Item 8 (the same as Question Item 3 for student interviewees). For instance, in the excerpt quoted below, NESTs are portrayed in the third person plural form not as a remote Other but as a distant idol based on the claim that “*they are able to*” provide “*authentic*” and thereby desirable linguacultural knowledge to students. Their English language output was described with words or phrases that can arouse positive feelings, i.e., “*lively and real to life*” vis-à-vis the negative lexicons that were adopted to portray that of Chinese EFL teachers, i.e., “*formalized and even dull*”.

They (NESTs) *are able to provide for students the authentic language and its related cultural knowledge*. The English of NESTs comes from real life and therefore *more vivid and real to life*. Our teachers (Chinese EFL teachers) can speak fluent English, but their oral output is *comparatively formalized or even dull*. (TI-8; Emphasis added)

For the administrators, no question was raised directly on this issue. However, their stances can be observed from their replies to Question Item 1 (*Do you think why native English language speaker teachers are hired to teach English in China?*). In answering this question, all of them asserted that NESTs are linguaculturally superior in English to NNESTs. It seems that they were most positive toward NESTs if the percentages for the students and teachers in support of NESTs discovered during the questionnaire surveys are taken into consideration (see Tables 5.1 and 5.2). As with most student and teacher interviewees, they asserted that NESTs are linguaculturally authoritative and to learn English with NESTs is conducive for students to develop NS or NS-like proficiency, an idealized objective in ELT tradition (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 2007a). Implied As A-8 claimed, though with a modified word, “*possible*”,

With NESTs, *it is possible for students to move close to NS English*. They can learn the NS pronunciation or intonation. The language and culture delivered by them (NESTs) in [classroom] teaching is *not only more authentic, but also more authoritative*. This is the reason why we insist on hiring NESTs. Their English is of the original flavor. (A-8; Emphasis added)

Other administrators, such as A-3, even contended that it is advantageous for students to learn English with NESTs even if they are pedagogically “*less qualified*”.

Regarding why NESTs are claimed to possess stronger linguacultural competence than NNESTs, data analysis reveals that the three groups of interviewees bought into the “birthright mentality” (Thomas, 1999, p. 6), a predominant conception in ELT. Namely, NESTs are linguaculturally more competent in English than NNESTs due to their birthhood (e.g., Cook, 1999; Llurda, 2004; Mahboob, 2005). As SI-20 put it,

[...] In comparison with Chinese [EFL] teachers, NESTs were born in English as a native language countries. As locals who grow up there, *it is natural* that they have deeper understandings of the English language and its culture and know more about the evolution of the history, culture and language of their own countries. (SI-20; Emphasis added)

This pro-nativeness mentality is explicitly reflected in the words and expressions – “born”, “grow up” and “natural” – in this excerpt. Ringing in these linguistic forms is the theoretical purport proposed by Chomsky (1965) on the linguistic competence of an ideal native speaker, which has been serving as the “regime of truth” (Foucault, 1984) in applied linguistics and ELT (e.g., Bhatt, 2002). Unfortunately, many interviewees, such as SI-20, were unaware that NS is a mythical construct and NNSs can acquire NS-like competence with sufficient efforts and proper training (see Davies, 1991, 2003).

All the findings presented above indicate that most of the participants were convinced that NESTs are linguaculturally more competent than NNESTs, inter alia, Chinese EFL teachers. For most of the interviewees, this difference seemed to be natural and objective (see also Medgyes, 1994) on birthhood account. In addition to the intergroup similarity in attitudinal tendency, the belief seemed more pronounced among the teachers and administrators according to the quantitative findings.

### 5.2.2 Pedagogical capability

As noted earlier (see Section 5.1), pedagogical capability constitutes another aspect of the professional quality of a teacher. In this study, it refers mainly to the ability of teachers to conduct classroom teaching with diverse teaching techniques or methods.

Presented below are the perceptions of the three participant groups on this issue.

Table 5.4 reports on the data in statistics collected from student participants through a Likert scale question (Item 19) on the instructional style and the implied capability of NESTs vis-à-vis Chinese EFL teachers. The mean reaches 3.38 (1.029), suggesting an overall pro-nativeness attitude among the students. This attitude also manifests itself in percentile distribution. Precisely, 48.3% of the 817 students expressed identification with the pedagogical superiority of NESTs whereas only 18.2% displayed oppositions. It is noted that one third (33.4%) of the students chose the “Not sure” answer.

Table 5.4 Student participants’ attitudes toward the pedagogical capability of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 19. Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, NESTs adopt diverse instructional methods.	5.0%	13.2%	33.5%	35.4%	12.9%	3.38	1.029

Notes: N = 817; NESTs = native English speaker teachers; SD = standard deviation

The pro-nativeness stance on this issue was also found predominant among the teacher participants. Observed from the statistics for Item 18 presented in the following table, 58.8% of the teachers, about 10% higher than that for the students, expressed (strong) agreement on the superiority of NESTs in pedagogical capability, with the mean reaching 3.66 (0.944). Only 10.3% of the teachers displayed an opposite position. It is about 10% lower than that for the student group. As with the student group, a certain percent (30.9%) of the teachers chose the “Not sure” answer.

Table 5.5 Teacher participants’ attitudes toward the pedagogical capability of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 18. Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, NESTs adopt diverse teaching methods.	1.5%	8.8%	30.9%	39.7%	19.1%	3.66	0.944

Notes: N = 68; NESTs = native English speaker teachers; SD = standard deviation

Despite the overall congruence in attitudinal tendency, the difference in mean between the students ( $3.38 \pm 1.029$ ) and the teachers ( $3.66 \pm 0.944$ ) seems to suggest that the latter were more supportive of NESTs. This is validated by the results of the Independent Sample t-test reported in Table 5.6 ( $t(883) = 2.197, p < 0.05$ ). As with the difference between these two participant groups in viewpoint on the linguacultural competence of NESTs versus NNESTs (see Table 5.3), the difference between the two groups is not great ( $d = 0.28$ ).

Table 5.6 Independent Samples t-test of the attitudes of students and teachers toward the pedagogical capability of NESTs versus Chinese EFL teachers

Students (N = 817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	2.197	883	0.03	0.28	0.28
3.38	1.028	3.66	0.944					

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen's d

The statistics stated above suggests that the three participant groups as an entirety were positive toward NESTs in respect of pedagogical capability. This attitude is also evident from the data collected through interviews with the students (Question Item 4) and teachers (Question Item 9). In particular, it manifests in the content of their remarks as well as the related discursive strategies and linguistic forms.

Specifically, 84.6% (22) of the 26 students and 57.1% (8) of the 14 teachers articulated explicit endorsement for NESTs. They asserted that NESTs employed diverse teaching methods in classroom teaching, which is conducive for creating a pleasant classroom atmosphere (e.g., SI-13, TI-3, TI-14), facilitating classroom interactions (e.g., SI-21, TI-7) and stimulating students' learning interests (e.g., SI-8; TI-11). As TI-7 put it, though she did not elaborate on the benefits for students,

NESTs adopt many teaching modes and teaching methods: discussion, debate, self-presentation, and diverse assessment system. They adopt encouragement and inspiration rather than satire, criticism and even scold. This is good for our students. (TI-7)

In her remarks, TI-7 listed a series of teaching methods or strategies that “*NESTs adopt*”.

The strength of her belief is also represented by the present tense and unmodified verbs, which help to grant naturalness and timelessness to the characteristics of the subject(s) under description (Williams, 2003). Moreover, the pedagogical practice of NESTs, such as attempting to give students “*encouragement and inspiration*”, seems to be aligned with the principle of modern education that advocates the empowerment of students (e.g., Frymier, Shulman, & Houser, 1996). Since Chinese EFL teachers were taken as the default reference, the praise of NESTs entails according them a less qualified or inferior professional status.

Of the eight administrators, four asserted that NESTs were pedagogically more capable, though the other four expressed reservations on the capability of certain types of NESTs. Compared with the statistics on the attitudes of the students and teachers that were obtained through questionnaire surveys (see Tables 5.4 and 5.5), it seems that the administrators concurred more with the teacher group in attitude. In addition to the macro comments as made by the students and teachers, many administrators provided comparatively concrete examples to justify the superiority of NESTs. For instance,

Our teachers (Chinese EFL teachers) still, that is to say, *I have a textbook and then follow it chapter by chapter*. However ... *they (NESTs) give students a lot of [reading] materials ... I think they talk less, but students act more and do more*. In contrast, *our teachers talk more in class*. You know, we have been advocating that teachers should talk less in class and let students do more. (A-6; Emphasis added)

An explicit self versus Other polarization is represented in this excerpt. According to A-6, NESTs prepare their own curriculum materials whereas Chinese EFL teachers follow textbooks mechanically. In addition, NESTs talk less in class and allow more freedom to students whereas Chinese EFL teachers tend to dominate the class with their own talk. Expressed explicitly in these dichotomous comparisons is the superiority of the instructional mode of NESTs, which seems to agree with the modern constructivist educational philosophy that emphasizes the central position of learners in education (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Newman, Griffin, & Cole, 1989; Vygotsky, 1978). Conversely, the teaching mode of Chinese EFL teachers is deemed as the representative of a backward or undemocratic educational culture.

When describing the differences between NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers, most of the interviewees put it affirmatively as if the differences were neutral, natural and free



from human intervention. The affirmativeness can be seen explicitly in the unmodified verbs and predicative words, such as “*It is obvious*” in the exemplifying excerpt below.

In terms of teaching style, *it is obvious* that they [NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers] are different. Furthermore, *the gap between them is so great* ... there is a large amount of differences between NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers in designing classroom teaching and in classroom management. ... NESTs adopt more diversified, more flexible, and more active approaches in teaching spoken or oral English. (A-5; Emphasis added)

Compared with the “*It is obvious*” attitude, what is more striking is A-5’s uses of the word “*gap*”, as this word represents not a “different” but a “deficit” discourse. Implied in this word is that Chinese EFL teachers are defective rather than different from NESTs in pedagogical capability.

As regards why NESTs were considered superior in respect of pedagogical capability, data analysis reveals that it is related to the superiority that the social and educational culture of Inner Circle countries are claimed to possess. This is evident in the comments by most of the interviewees. To be specific, they claimed that NESTs have acquired an advanced social and educational culture in their growing-up process and therefore are pedagogically more capable than their nonnative counterparts. As A-7 stated,

*NESTs have received western education since they were young* ... Education in western societies encourage students to challenge their teachers, challenge the authority. They think that every student has his/her own merits and seldom evaluate a student in reference to examination scores. *Since NESTs come from this cultural environment, it is natural they adopt more flexible teaching mode.* (A-7; Emphasis added)

In addition to the predominant agreement on the pedagogical superiority of NESTs, a certain number of interviewees (3 students, 6 teachers and 4 administrators) expressed reservations about the pedagogical capability of certain types of NESTs, claiming that not all NESTs adopt a variety of teaching techniques in classroom teaching. This may explain in part why many teachers selected the “Not sure” answer to the Likert scale statement on the pedagogical merit of NESTs (see Table 5.5). Individual difference in personality or character was regarded by them as one significant factor accountable for the teaching style of a teacher. For example, in explaining his viewpoint, TI-2 recounted her experiences with a NEST, a person deemed introvert in character.

There are many different kinds of foreign teachers (NESTs). There was a foreign teacher at my university *who taught English almost in the same way as Chinese EFL teachers*. It depends on their personal characters. It's hard to make a comment on how NESTs teach [the English language]. (TI-2; Emphasis added)

While asserting that NESTs are not homogeneous, TI-2 seemed to ignore individual differences among Chinese EFL teachers, who, as an entirety, were considered less competent pedagogically than NESTs. This is expressed explicitly in the statement, “[*The NS teacher*] *taught English almost in the same way as Chinese EFL teachers*”. In her logic, all Chinese EFL teachers are on par with this less qualified NEST.

Observed from the findings presented above, it is evident that most of the participants considered NESTs pedagogically more competent than NNESTs, particularly Chinese EFL teachers. This stance seems more marked among the teachers and administrators. In addition, they ascribed the merit of NESTs in this aspect to the Inner Circle culture. All these findings, in tandem with the strong support of NESTs in linguacultural competence, are indicative of a pro-nativeness mentality within the three participant groups. Nevertheless, some interviewees expressed reservations about the pedagogical competence of certain types of NESTs. In face of these findings as well as the actual diversity of NESTs, a question arises, namely, what type of foreign English language teachers the three participant groups expected their universities to hire or what criteria should be followed in hiring practice.

### **5.3 Expected criteria for hiring foreign English language teachers**

The viewpoints of the three stakeholder groups on the criteria for hiring foreign English language teachers can be observed from their responses to three paralleling questions of those that were utilized in interviews (Item 5 for students; Item 10 for teachers; Item 3 for administrators). The questions ask directly what types of foreign teachers should be hired to teach English in China. Data analysis illustrates that three major hiring criteria were proposed, involving L1 status and country base, academic background, and race. In terms of the first two criteria, no significant controversy in opinion was found among the three groups of interviewees. However, discrepancies regarding race were located. Presented in this section are their viewpoints on these three criteria.

### 5.3.1 L1 status and nation base

L1 status and nation base have been taken as a core parameter in global ELT job market, as they are usually regarded as the symbol of the qualified English language. This is also the major concern for most of the interviewees.

When answering the question (Item 5), 22 (84.6%) of the 24 student interviewees stated that they expected their universities to recruit foreign English language teachers from Inner Circle countries. Of them, 17 (77.3%) asserted that they preferred NESTs from Britain or America, which they deemed as the hotbed of the genuine or qualified English language. In response to the question (Item 10), 11 (78.6%) of the 14 teachers also declared that they would hire NESTs from Inner Circle countries, particularly those from Britain or America, if allowed to make hiring decisions. All the administrators expressed the same point of view, contending that L1 status and particular nation base should serve as the prerequisite for hiring foreign English language teachers at least for their own universities. As A-5 stated,

First of all, in terms of hiring foreign [English language] teachers, and firstly, *English should be their native language* ... Not all foreigners with brown hair and blue eyes are acceptable. Right, *English should be their native language*. When we submit to the university our requirements for foreign teachers, [we make it clear that] *the first ideal choice* is those from Britain or America. *The second choice* is those from Australia, New Zealand and Canada. At the same time, *English must be their native language* ... In general, *we don't hire* foreign EFL teachers from South East Asia, Africa or other areas. (A-5; Emphasis added)

In this comment, A-5 stated repeatedly the L1 status of foreign teachers of English, namely, “*English should be their native language*”. As with other interviewees, he prioritized NESTs from Britain and America, placing NESTs from other Inner Circle countries, such as Australia or Canada, into a secondary position. More importantly, he refused to acknowledge the NS status of Outer Circle English speakers. For him, only those from Britain and America are genuine NSs, though he did not articulate this view explicitly. In fact, this stance manifests in the hiring practice of his university, which rejects English language teachers “*from South East Asia, Africa or other areas*”.

Compared with A-5, other administrators, such as A-4, justified their favor for NESTs by denying more openly the legitimacy of Outer Circle English and the NS status of their speakers, though emphasizing that it is just personal perspective. For instance,

When hiring foreign EFL teachers, we need to follow these criteria. Firstly, English should be their native language. Although the EFL teachers from India, Pakistan, Nigeria and Singapore use a lot of English, *I personally do not consider them native English speakers...* (A-4; Emphasis added)

Although other interviewees admitted the legitimate status of Outer Circle English, they claimed that it has low intelligibility and therefore Outer Circle English language teachers are limited in professional competence. For example, SI-3 asserted that it usually takes a long time for Chinese English learners to get accustomed to the accent of Indian English. However, whether a language variety is intelligible or not depends mostly on the extent to which listeners are familiarized with it (e.g., Smith, 1992). In this logic, it is not the assumed deficits of Outer Circle English but the insufficient exposure to it that leads to comprehension problems. Some others proposed more requirements on professional qualifications for prospective Outer Circle applicants. As TI-7 added, “*an applicant from a country like India could be accepted if he/she had teacher certificate and rich teaching experiences*” (TI-7). It is obvious that she adopted double standards. This is in actuality a common practice, in which teaching credentials are usually required of Outer Circle applicants whereas no such demand is raised for those from Inner Circle countries (e.g., Braine, 2010; Jenkins, 2006; Suresh, 2000).

### 5.3.2 Academic background

Most of the interviewees also proposed that relevant academic backgrounds should be required of the prospective foreign teachers of English.

To be specific, 76.9% (20) of the 26 students, 78.6% (10) of the 14 teachers and all of the eight administrators put forward this criterion explicitly. As A-1 stated, though with a modified expression, “*I think*”,

In terms of the academic backgrounds of foreign teachers, with the increasing improvement of the English proficiency that students have achieved in secondary schools, I think *the strict [academic] requirements that are followed in recruiting Chinese EFL teachers should be applied to the hiring of foreign teachers* <sup>[12]</sup>. They [NESTs] can’t teach us something at random. (A-1; Emphasis added)

---

<sup>[12]</sup> Currently, Chinese applicants for a teaching position at colleges or universities in China are usually required to hold a doctoral degree and have a certain number of academic publications. In some cases, the degree requirement may be lower, but at least a Master’s degree.

The remarks of A-1 is reminiscent of the professional qualifications of most foreign English language teachers working in China. They only hold a Bachelor's degree or even a high school diploma and have no language-teaching experiences before coming to teaching English in China (see Niu & Wolff, 2003). Similar to the work arrangement in many other Expanding Circle countries, NESTs in China are usually allocated to teaching spoken English class (see Jeon & Lee, 2006). The enhancement of Chinese students' English language proficiency, according to A-1, has made students expect more subject knowledge from the teachers. This may account for why most of the participants proposed higher academic qualifications for prospective NESTs.

In comparison with A-1, who expressed a general viewpoint regarding the requirements for NESTs, many students (e.g., SI-3; SI-8; SI-15) and teachers (e.g., TI-7; TI-5; TI-3) proposed two concrete criteria, i.e., work experience and academic degree. For instance,

Except the [English as the first] language background, *they need hold an academic degree and have teaching experiences* ... we have to make a distinction [of the applicants] ... Not every foreigner can teach English just like not every Chinese can teach the Chinese language. (TI-7; Emphasis added)

The three other administrators raised specific requirements for academic degree. They asserted that EFL teachers should “*hold an MA degree*” (A-5) or “*have to be a TESOL major*” (A-3). For those who are hired merely to teach spoken English, A-2 lowered the degree requirement, but insisted on discipline relevance. For him, “*there is no problem with the holders of a Bachelor's degree, but they have to be majors in linguistics, culture or education*”. However, for those who are hired to teach classes of higher level, “*a Master's degree is a prerequisite*” (A-2).

The demand for higher academic qualifications of the prospective NESTs illustrates that many participants, such as TI-7, have become aware that a person cannot become an English language teacher automatically merely because English is his/her native language (see Phillipson, 1992, p. 185). However, the real situation of hiring NESTs is far from expected. Most of the administrators (e.g., A-2, A-3 and A-7) complained that it is hard to recruit qualified NESTs due to the limited budget of their universities and the shortage of qualified foreign English language teachers at job markets. Usually,

they have to accept the native English speakers who are in fact not English language teachers in their home countries, with no academic and work experience related to ELT.

### 5.3.3 Race

In addition to L1 status and nation base as well as academic background, the three groups of interviewees expressed their opinions on the race or ethnical backgrounds of prospective applicants. As noted earlier, intergroup discrepancies in opinion existed regarding this criterion.

Of the 26 students, 18 (69.2%) stated that they had no racial preference as long as the foreign English language teachers come from Inner Circle countries, Britain or American in particular (e.g., SI-5; SI-8; SI-12). Of the 14 teachers, 10 (71.4%) also stated they only care about whether the foreign teachers come from “*the traditional English speaking countries*” (TI-11), “*speak standard English*” (TI-6), have “*intelligible English pronunciation*” (TI-4) and can serve as “*reference model*” (TI-1) for their students. Similar conceptions were expressed by three (37.5%) of the eight administrators. By contrast, eight (30.8%) students, four (28.6%) teachers and five (62.5%) administrators all claimed that White Anglo-Americans should be hired.

Two common reasons can be abstracted from the responses of those in support of hiring White NESTs. One consists in their conviction that native English speaking Caucasians are better educated than the colored counterparts. This racist stance can be exemplified by the comment by TI-12. In defending her stance, she resorted to the positionality of some of her friends to prove that the viewpoint is not just her own.

In terms of English language teaching, *I am inclined to* [support] the White who come from Britain or American. *I think* they are well education, and their English is pure and their thoughts are rigorous. Currently, some of my friends ask me to look for some foreign teachers to provide tutorials for their kids, *their requirement is that the foreign teachers should be the White from Britain or America.* (TI-12; Emphasis added)

Compared with TI-12’s modified expressions, such as “*I think*” or “*I am inclined to*”, the remarks of the five administrators in favor of White NESTs are much more assertive, for example, “*Of course, the White is the ideal*” (A-7) or “*Definitely, [we should hire] the White who were born, grew up and received education in [mainstream] English*

*speaking countries*” (A-1). Observed from this “*of course*” stance, it can be concluded that these administrators seemed more inclined to accept the Whiteness as property ideology (Harris, 1993, as cited in Ruecker & Ives, 2015).

The other reason resides in the traditional association between Whiteness and the NS status. Most of the participants in support of the Whiteness principle claimed that White NESTs look like real NSs. In other words, only the White are real owners of English. This may explain why they refused to identify with the linguistic and pedagogical value of overseas Chinese, even those who have stayed in Inner Circle countries for many years. As A-5 put it in an assertive manner,

Even for the Chinese who have stayed in Britain or America for many years, even if they hold higher academic degree or higher academic status, *they don't look like Caucasians ... we don't advocate hiring those of other colors except the White.* (A-5; Emphasis added)

The statement of A-5 reverberates in the actual hiring practices in China. For example, Shao (2005) and Hsu (2005) are both Chinese Americans, with English as their L1 and educational experiences in TESOL. When applying for English language teaching positions in China, they were rejected for reasons similar to that as stated by A-5, i.e., *we don't advocate hiring those of other colors except the White.*

This section analyzes the viewpoints of the three groups of participants on the criteria they expect to be followed in hiring foreign English language teachers or on what types of foreign English language teachers should be hired in China. Indicated by the data, NESTs from Britain or America, particularly those with related academic qualifications, enjoyed special preference. Although the majority of the students and teachers expressed no concern about the racial or ethnical background of prospective teachers, the ideology of Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993, as cited in Ruecker & Ives, 2015) was found persistent among the majority of the administrators. Suggested by these findings as well as those presented in Section 6.2, it is apparent that NESTs enjoyed predominant support among the three participant groups. Notwithstanding this finding, it remains a question whether NESTs are viewed as the ideal teacher in actual English language teaching and learning practices.

## 5.4 The ideal English language teacher

The answers to the question about the ideal teacher can be seen from the responses of the three participant groups to three paralleled semi-open questions (Item 22 for students; Item 27 for teachers; Item 4 for administrators). Each item presents a hypothetical scenario, in which the participants were asked to make a choice from five categories of teachers – equal in pedagogical competence but different in linguacultural and ethnic background – and provide reasons. The five teachers include Teacher A (Inner Circle NS), Teacher B (Inner Circle NS with a Chinese pedigree, Teacher C (Outer Circle NS), Teacher D (Outer Circle NNS) and Teacher E (local Chinese EFL teacher). This section deals with their choices and the reasons they stated.

### 5.4.1 Teacher selection

Regarding what type of teachers is upheld as the ideal with whom to learn English, data analysis suggests mixed findings. Overall, a strong preference for NESTs from Inner Circle countries was found among the three participant groups. However, an unneglectable percent of participants expressed favor for local Chinese EFL teachers. Interestingly, Inner Circle NESTs with a Chinese ethnic pedigree and Outer Circle NESTs and NNESTs enjoyed limited popularity among the participants.

Table 5.4 summarizes in percentage the choices made by the students. Suggested by the statistics, 53.5% (328) of the students expected to learn English with Teacher A. This percentage is much higher than that for any other selection. Ranked in the second position is the ratio (20.7%) representing those who chose Teacher E. Of the other three categories of teachers, Teacher B collected most support.

Table 5.7 Student participants' response frequencies about the ideal English language teacher

Item 22. Of Teachers A/B/C/D/E, whose class do you expect to attend most?	A	B	C	D	E	Total
Students (N = 817)	53.5% (437)	12.4% (101)	8.7% (71)	4.8% (39)	20.7% (169)	100%

The overall attitudinal tendency of the teacher participants was found similar to that of the students. According to the statistics summarized in Table 5.8 concerning what type



of teachers with whom they expect their students to learn English, 44.1% (30) of the participants selected Teacher A, followed by 32.4% (22) who chose Teacher E. Of the three other types of teachers, Teacher C received most support.

Table 5.8 Teacher participants' response frequencies about the ideal English language teacher

Item 27. Of Teachers A/B/C/D/E, whose class do you expect your students to attend most?	A	B	C	D	E	Total
Teachers (N = 68)	44.1% (30)	4.4% (3)	16.2% (11)	2.9% (2)	32.4% (22)	100%

Despite the similar attitudinal tendency, differences between students and teachers also exist. Apparently, the percentage for the students favoring Teacher A (53.5%) is about 10% higher than that for the teachers (44.1%). By contrast, the ration for the students in favor of Teacher E (20.7%) is more than 10% lower than that for teachers (32.4%). Interestingly, Teachers C collected more support in percentage from the teachers whereas Teacher B received more favor from the students.

The general preference for Teacher A among the students and teachers was also found among the administrators. In answering Question Item 4 during the interviews, 75% (6) of the administrators expected their students to learn English with Teacher A. In terms of percentage, it seems that the administrator group were more supportive of Inner Circle NS as an ESL/EFL teacher than the other two participant groups.

The findings reported above corroborate the overall pro-nativeness attitude among the participant as discussed in Sections 5.2 and 5.3. Nevertheless, Teacher B received little support despite his/her NS status. This finding warrants further research, as most of the students and teachers indicated no preference for teachers of particular racial background when answering questions on the teacher hiring issue (see Section 5.3).

#### 5.4.2 Reasons for teacher choice

In addition to making choices, the participants were asked to provide reasons. This subsection analyzes the reasons supplied, focusing on their justifications for supporting Teacher A (NESTs from Inner Circle countries) and Teacher E (Chinese EFL teachers).

According to the data collected, 61.3% (268) of the 437 students who selected Teacher A and 76.7% (23) of the 30 teachers making the same choice supplied reasons to defend their selections. The most frequently raised reason is that one can acquire authentic English and its related culture from Teacher A because he is the owner of the English language. Words and expressions in praise of Teacher A are pervasive in their remarks. For instance, NESTs from Inner Circle countries were described as being able to speak “*Standard*” English (e.g., S-100, S-207, T-4 or T-10), “*authentic*” English (e.g., S-495 or S-440) or “*unadulterated*” English (e.g., S-189, S-561, T-63, or T-54) and have “*standard pronunciation*” (e.g., S-82, S-482 or S-690). In the meantime, Teacher A was claimed to know more about the culture of Inner Circle countries (e.g., S-306, S-344, T-5, or T-20). In light of these two merits of NESTs, learners can acquire authentic English (e.g., S-124). In this sense, these reasons resonate with the overall endorsement for linguacultural competence granted to NESTs among the three participant groups (see Sections 5.2); they are also aligned with the reasons for proposing the criterion, “L1 status and nation based”, for hiring foreign teachers of English (see Section 5.3.1). As S-124 stated,

NESTs *know more* about the culture related to English. *English is their mother tongue*, and [their] English pronunciation and [their] use of English are *more authentic*. [If learning English with them], I can acquire *more simon-pure* English. (S-124; Emphasis added)

The six administrators also followed this logic in explaining why they expected their students to learn English with Teacher A. For instance,

I expect our students to choose foreign teachers from *countries where English serves as the mother tongue*. I think foreign teachers from those countries are the “*authentic*”, just as you come to China rather than Japan if you want to learn Chinese ... We expect our students to learn *the most authentic language and culture* from foreign teachers coming from countries with English as a mother tongue. (A-7; Emphasis added)

With regard to the choice of Teacher E (local Chinese EFL teachers), 71.6% (121) of the 169 students and 90.9% (20) of the 22 teachers provided reasons. Similar to the core rationale for the endorsement of NESTs from Inner Circle countries, the construct of linguacultural competence or the “mother tongue” logic was resorted to by most of those students and teachers. Nevertheless, it refers, in this context, to the Chinese EFL

teachers' competence in the Chinese language and its attendant culture, which, according to them, is conducive for enhancing teaching and learning effects.

Specifically, 72 (59.5%) of the 121 students and 13 (65%) of the 20 teachers maintained that the linguaculture shared between teachers and students can help to facilitate their communications. This perspective is evident in the positive words and phrases that are of high frequency, such as “*convenient to communicate*” (e.g., S-47, S-534 or T-66) or “*easy to communicate*” (e.g., T-43 or T-59). It was also stated that Chinese EFL teachers can make occasional use of the Chinese language to render difficult teaching and learning content comprehensible to students and this is an advantage that NESTs do not possess (e.g., S-120, S-272 or S-527). As one student put it,

After all, English is a foreign language [for us]. It is inevitable that some parts of the English language are incomprehensible to students, and need explanations by teachers in Chinese. (S-645)

In addition, many students and teachers stated that the shared cultural background between Chinese EFL teachers and students could help teachers design and adjust their teaching practices because they are familiar with the education culture, particularly the “culture of learning” (Cortezzi & Jin, 1999) in China. Precisely, Chinese EFL teachers were claimed to “*know more about the way Chinese student receive knowledge*” (S-215) and “*how Chinese people learn the English language*” (S-688) and therefore “*are able to provide for us the most straight and beneficial way of learning English*” (S-644).

The positive attitudes expressed assertively toward Chinese EFL teachers are aligned with the findings of the previous studies (e.g., Árvai & Medgyes, 2000; Ma, 2012; Medgyes, 1994). However, these attitudes seem to contribute conversely to the hegemonic status of NESTs in a sense, rather than confirming the professional merits of Chinese EFL teachers. For example, when emphasizing that learning difficulties can be solved by teachers' resorting to the mother tongue which they share with students, it seems to imply that Chinese students are deficient in English and unable to understand NESTs and/or that Chinese EFL teachers have low English proficiency and cannot make learning/teaching content comprehensible to students in English. In this logic, the selection of Teacher E may have less to do with the realization of the professional limitations of NESTs but more with low English proficiency on the part of Chinese

EFL teachers and learners. These findings, in tandem with the predominant support of NESTs among the three participant groups presented in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, may lead to their unawareness of the long-standing inequalities between NESTs and NNESTs at workplaces, where English language teachers are usually treated based on L1 status and national identity rather than professional qualification. The following section explores their viewpoints on this issue.

### 5.5 Viewpoints on workplace inequalities

The viewpoints of the three participant groups on this issue can be observed from their responses to three questions employed in interviews (Item 6 for students; Item 11 for teachers; Item 5 for administrators). The questions are identical in content, focusing on how the three participant groups perceive the phenomena that NESTs usually receive higher payment <sup>[13]</sup> and greater respects in workplaces than do Chinese EFL teachers or whether they regard these practices discriminatory.

Data analysis indicates a prevalent “misrecognition” (Bourdieu, 1983) and a tolerance of the inequalities on the part of most participants. Specifically, 69.2% (18) of the 26 student participants and 64.3% (9) of the 14 teachers considered it normal to offer higher payment and more respects to NESTs. The eight administrators all noticed the inequalities, but 62.5% (5) of them considered unequal payment tolerable. Reasons provided by the three participant groups are complicated.

A reason shared by 13 (72.2%) of the 18 students resonates with the morality of “hospitality” that has been advocated and honored in traditional Chinese culture. They contended, *“There is nothing wrong or inappropriate with offering higher payment and more respects to foreign English language teachers (SI-2), since they have travelled thousands of miles all the way to China (SI-13) to teach authentic English and its*

---

<sup>[13]</sup> The difference in payment for NESTs and local Chinese EFL teachers is an arguable issue. Some people assert that the monthly or yearly payment for NESTs is much higher than that for local teachers, though they have the same qualifications. Others maintain that this is not the case, as local teachers enjoy many fringe benefits, such as pension or long-term medical insurance. However, the latter perspective seems less convincing. An important reason is that most NESTs usually work at Chinese universities for a short period from several weeks to a few years whereas most local teachers stay at the universities until retirement. In this case, benefits, such as pension in China, does not apply to NESTs, who usually get those benefits in their own countries. Therefore, this study does not take into account the fringe benefits, focusing only on regular salary.

*related culture to Chinese students* (SI-4). Some students (e.g., SI-5, SI-8 or SI-11) resorted to the “supply and demand” principle at commercial markets, asserting that NESTs are scarcely supplied in China and therefore deserve better treatment at workplaces. These two reasons – the embodiment of legitimization through morality and rationality (see van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999) – are observable simultaneously from the responses of other students. For instance,

*I don't think this is a discrimination against Chinese EFL teachers. When NESTs come to teach English in China, they should be regarded as friends coming from faraway places and we should treat them warmly and considerately. Such practice can be said to represent the image of our country... Furthermore, not many foreign teachers are available in China, as evidenced from the limited quantity of foreign teachers at my university... (SI-19)*

Of the nine teachers who denied the discrimination against Chinese EFL teachers in workplaces, three also resorted to the “supply and demand” logic to justify their stance, contending metaphorically, “*when the fruit is scarcest, its taste is sweetest*” (TI-3); three asserted that NESTs are superior in professional competence due to English as their L1. In addition to these reasons, the three others deemed it appropriate if taking into account the income standard of NESTs in their home countries. As TI-10 asserted,

*I don't think this is a discrimination against Chinese EFL teachers. When universities hire foreign teachers, the teachers are normally what are needed in some disciplines or specializations. This is an active measure taken by universities to attract foreign teachers and promote teaching reforms. Moreover, quite a large proportion of teachers come from developed countries. They may not want to come to China to teach [English] if paid according to [the payment criteria for] Chinese EFL teachers holding the same professional rank as they do. (TI-10; Emphasis added)*

In this comment, TI-10 stated that offering higher payment and greater respects serves as a strategy to attract NESTs to teach English in China. Implied in this objective is that NESTs are superior to Chinese EFL teachers and can provide guidance for ELT reforms in China. Following this logic, she declared that to offer higher payment and more respects to NESTs “*is [not] a discrimination against Chinese EFL teachers*”.

Compared with the reasons provided by most of the students and teachers, the opinions of the eight administrators regarding this issue are more complicated. 62.5% (5) of the administrators acknowledged the inequality in payment. However, they deemed it tolerable, asserting that the gap in payment is not as wide as before due to the increase

in remuneration for Chinese EFL teachers in recent years. For instance,

In terms of the current situation, *I think* there is *no big or obvious difference* [in payment] ... *I think* the income or payment of NESTs has not made big progress in the past few years. In contrast, the payment of our domestic teachers [Chinese EFL teachers] has definitely made bigger progress. *So I think the difference is not so big now and acceptable.* (A-8; Emphasis added)

Implied in the “I think” remarks of A-8 is that the gap in remuneration still exists, though it may not be as wide as before. Moreover, she and other administrators claimed that the gap would not cause a psychological stir among Chinese EFL teachers. In the words of A-3, *“there is an agreement in our heart, that is, this unequal payment... is acceptable” ... because NESTs come from foreign countries and small in number*”.

While the five administrators acknowledged the discrimination against Chinese EFL teachers in respect of payment, they did not consider granting greater respects to NESTs in workplaces a symptom of self-degradation or self-discrimination. Although the three others acknowledged the (self-)discriminatory nature of such practice, they insisted that it should be tolerated in order to renew the work contract with the present NESTs or attract more NESTs to their universities because the presence of NESTs would make it possible to *“recruit more students”* (A-3) and then *“make more profits”* (A-6). As such, NESTs serve as a valuable asset to them.

As regards the reasons for the workplace inequalities, most administrators (e.g., A-2, A-3, A-4 and A-6) maintained that the inequality is related to the socio-historical context of China but will change for the better. For example, A-4 stated that the practice of offering higher payment and granting more respects to NESTs is derived from the national policies that have upheld NESTs as *“foreign expert”* since China adopted the Open and Reform policy in 1978 as well as the related high demand for NESTs in the ever-increasing ELT market in China. Nevertheless, they believed that inequality would be removed gradually with the *“the economic and social development of China and the related increasingly objective views about NESTs”* (A-2). Implied in this perspective is that Chinese EFL teachers need to tolerate the unequal practices in workplaces at least for the time being.

Based on the viewpoints of the three groups of interviewees presented above, it is

obvious that most of the students and teachers regarded offering higher payment to NESTs and granting them greater respects in workplaces as being normal or even necessary. Although most of the administrators realized the discriminatory nature of these practices, they insisted that the discrimination is not serious or has to be tolerated for the development of their EFL programs. The consequence of this tolerance as well as the unawareness may further naturalize the workplace inequalities between NESTs and NNESTs.

## **5.6 Discussion and summary**

This chapter explores the first research question, i.e., the attitudes toward English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds held by the three groups of Chinese ELT stakeholders – students, teachers and administrators. It also analyzes intergroup attitudinal (dis)similarities, answering in part Research Question 5. Presented in this section is a summary of the major findings as well as related discussions.

In terms of professional quality (linguacultural competence in English and pedagogical capability), NESTs were generally considered superior to NNESTs, particularly Chinese EFL teachers. Major reasons were found related to the conventional conception in ELT that NESTs are the proprietors of English and can provide for students authentic English and genuine Inner Circle culture (e.g., Nayar, 1994; Widdowson, 1994). They are also pertinent to the traditional ideology in ELT that praises Inner Circle education culture as being advanced and modern (e.g., Holliday, 2005, 2006). In addition, the pro-nativeness attitude was found more prominent among the teachers and administrators.

With regard to the criteria that are expected to be followed in hiring foreign English language teachers, the pro-nativeness attitude was also found prevalent among the participants. To be specific, most of them expressed a strong preference for NESTs, particularly those from Britain or America. At the same time, they expected NESTs with work experiences and academic degrees related to TESOL. Notably, the majority of the students and teachers expressed no special preference for NESTs from a certain racial or ethnical background whereas more than half of the administrators granted explicit endorsement for White NESTs.

Regarding the question about the ideal English language teacher with whom to learn English, NESTs from Inner Circle countries were generally prioritized for the same reason that most of the participants stated for their support of NESTs as being professionally (more) competent. However, NESTs with a Chinese ethnical pedigree received limited favor. This finding stands in sharp contrast to the denial of racism as expressed by most of the students and teachers in responding to the question on teacher hiring issues. Meanwhile, a certain percent of the participants expressed preferences for local Chinese EFL teachers, claiming that the shared linguacultural background between students and teachers is conducive for generating more pedagogical benefits. However, implied in this viewpoint is that Chinese English learners and teachers are deficient in English, an obstacle that hinders their communications in English and/or prevents them from using English to deal with complicated learning/teaching tasks.

As for the phenomenon that NESTs usually enjoy higher payment and greater respects in workplaces, most of the students and teachers stated that it entails no discrimination against local Chinese EFL teachers, asserting that NESTs deserve such treatment due to their superb professional competence and the tradition of “hospitality” in China. Although the majority of the administrators acknowledged the inequalities between NESTs and local Chinese EFL teachers at workplaces, they maintained that the unequal treatment is not severe and needs tolerating for the well-being of their EFL programs.

All of the findings summarized above suggest that most of the participants upheld NESTs as being superior professionally while granting a secondary or inferior status to NNESTs, particularly Chinese EFL teachers. It is evident that this perception resonates with the colonial Self versus Other politics (Holliday, 2006, pp. 385-386; see also Kubota & Lin, 2006). Following the logic that ideology “control the knowledge acquired and shared by a group” (van Dijk, 2001b, p.15), it can be concluded that most of the participants were overwhelmed by Native-speakerism, *inter alia*, the “NS fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185). This psychological state can help interpret their unawareness of the racist essence of granting little support to NESTs with a Chinese pedigree. In particular, it accounts for, at least in part, the participants’ unconsciousness – to borrow the words of Kramsch (1997) – that NS is a mythical construct “created by those who would like to accept the distinction between native speakers and nonnative speakers”



(p. 363). It is also helpful to explain their unconsciousness of workplace inequalities. Since these three participant groups are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice, their attitudes reflect to a great extent the top-down manipulation and by extension the dominant ideology in China's EFL education. As such, it can be concluded that Native-speakerism is still alive in China's ELT.

These findings are not alone. On the one hand, they are corroborative of the theoretical purports of many critical linguists on the colonial Self versus Other politics in ELT (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2012; Pennycook, 1998). On the other hand, they are aligned with the results of a large number of studies conducted in various ELT contexts (see Section 2.2.1). For instance, a similar pro-nativeness attitude was revealed by those studies to do with professional qualities of NESTs and NNESTs (e.g., Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002), practices of hiring foreign teachers of English (e.g., Doan, 2016; Mahboob & Golden, 2013) and workplace discrimination against NNESTs (e.g., Methitham, 2012; Phothongsunan & Suwanarak, 2008). Meanwhile, discrepancies with other studies were located. For instance, contrary to this study, positive attitudes toward the professional qualities of NNESTs were found prevalent among the students and administrators in the studies conducted by Moussu (2002, 2006).

Ideology is context specific and this is also true of Native-speakerism (Holliday, 2005, p. 8; Houghton & Rivers, 2013, p. 5). Meanwhile, discourse is historical and interacts with many sociopolitical factors (e.g., Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 2001a). In this sense, the sociocultural and historical-political factors surrounding EFL education in China must be taken into account in order to gain an in-depth insight into this attitudinal tendency among the three participant groups. The contextual factors can also help to explain the (dis)similarities in finding between this study and others. Of those factors, the historical-present power disparity in politics, economy and culture between Inner Circle countries and China as well as the governance of EFL education executed by Chinese government seems to account most for the predominant pro-nativeness attitude among these three participant groups. One significant reason lies in that power can ensure that "[certain] orders of discourse are ideologically harmonized internally" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 30).

As stated earlier (see Section 1.1), the NS construct has a historical validity in the West,

particularly in Inner Circle countries (e.g., Phillipson, 1992, 2009). It was invented alongside the emergence of the European nation-state-language-culture politics in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century (e.g., Bonfiglio, 2013) and further developed in the process of cultural contacts and conflicts between the Center and the Periphery during the colonial and neo-colonial period (e.g., Aneja, 2016; Pennycook, 1998). At the same time, this construct has been constantly legitimized by expert discourse (see van Leeuwen, 2007), such as the Chomskyan linguistic competence notion (Chomsky, 1965), Interlanguage theory (Selinker, 1972), Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1983) as well as the concomitant SLA research agendas featured with what Bley-Vroman (1983) called “comparative fallacy” (see also Cook, 1999, p. 189). Due to the historical-present hegemonic status of the English speaking West, this Western NS construct has been accepted almost indiscriminately by the ELT society in China as the theoretical and practical guideline, with its loaded chauvinistic ideology misrecognized as being natural, normal and commonsensical. This may account for why NESTs were generally upheld as the proprietor of English and idealized as being linguaculturally competent than their nonnative counterparts.

The historical-present power disparity between Inner Circle countries and China has led to China’s voluntary acceptance of the authority of the English speaking West. As stated previously (see Section 1.4), ELT in China was initiated officially alongside the Self-strengthening Movement launched by Manchu government in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the intention to acquire the advanced scientific knowledge and technologies from the West (e.g., Pan & Seargeant, 2012). This motive has been further strengthened in the past few decades, particularly since China adopted the Open and Reform policy in 1978. In this self-subjugation ethos, it is easy to reproduce the Native-speakerist ideology, i.e., the English speaking West is better. This is evident from the pro-native stance expressed by most of the participants in this study, who claimed that NESTs grew up in the English speaking West and have picked up an advanced or superb educational culture. It is natural that they are pedagogically more competent than their nonnative counterparts.

The national ELT policies in support of NESTs can be regarded as another significant factor that contributes to reproducing and reinforcing the “NS fallacy” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 185) among Chinese ELT stakeholders. For instance, foreign English language

teachers have been constructed discursively as “*foreign experts*” in many regulations formulated and issued by Chinese government, as was stated by A-4 in the interview (see Section 5.5). The idealization of NESTs from Inner Circle countries is further reproduced by a recent regulation promulgated in China regarding the employment of foreign teachers (e.g., SAOFEA, 2015), which provides that foreign English language teachers must be NSs and if not, they must hold at least a Bachelor’s degree or above obtained from Inner Circle educational institutes (see Section 1.4.3). In this case, the superiority of NESTs becomes legitimized “by its authoritative source” (Martín & van Dijk, 1997, p. 530). Due to the centralized political system in China, its EFL education is governed strictly by government policies (e.g., Gong & Holliday, 2013). With the implementation of these policies or regulations, the authoritative status of NESTs is constantly reproduced and reinforced ideologically. This in turn leads to the favorable treatment to NESTs at workplaces, with the Native-speakerist ideology, particularly the idealization of NESTs further domesticated. As a corollary, few questions are raised about the obvious inequalities between NESTs and Chinese EFL teachers. This may account for why most of the students and teachers in this study asserted that it entails no discrimination against Chinese EFL teachers to offer higher payment to NESTs and grant them more respects in workplaces. It may also explain in part why most of the administrators maintained that the practices in favor of NESTs need tolerating, though they themselves realized the discriminatory essence of these practices.

In addition to the overall positive attitude toward NESTs among the three participant groups, intergroup differences were found. In terms of professional qualities of NESTs versus NNESTs (Section 5.1), statistics suggests that the teachers and administrators seemed to be more positive toward NESTs. This finding corroborates the result of most of the empirical studies (see Section 2.2.1), i.e., a strong “imposter syndrome” (Bernat, 2008) among many NNESTs. Pre-service teacher education can be resorted to in accounting for this difference, as a person’s opinion on social entities usually “depends on [his/her] early attitudes or ideologies ... as well as [his/her] personal experiences” (van Dijk, 2008, p. 15). In China, most of the teachers and administrators are English majors and graduated from normal or teacher education universities. This is also true of the teachers and administrators in this study. As a rule, EFL programs for English major students in China require students to attain NS or NS-like competence in English. Such pre-service education experience might have nurtured among the teachers and

administrators a pro-nativeness “habitus” (Bourdieu, 1984) or a psychological complex that idealizes or even worships NESTs.

Although most of the students and teachers considered NESTs professionally more competent (see Section 5.2), an unneglectable percent of the students and teachers selected Chinese EFL teachers as the ideal English language teacher with whom to learn English (see Tables 5.7 and 5.8). Arguably, this represents their reflections on the actual teaching effects of these two categories of teachers. That more teachers in percentage expressed this stance may reflect their concern about the comparatively low English proficiency of their students, who, as non-English majors, may not be able to understand NESTs. In addition, this choice may have to do with the self-esteem or face-saving psychology of those teachers.

Other interesting findings are revealed in this study. As noted earlier, NESTs with a Chinese ethnical pedigree received limited support from the students and teachers (see Section 5.4.1), forming a sharp contrast to their denial of race criterion on hiring foreign English language teachers (see Section 5.3.3). This can be viewed as an example that many people deny racism in front of others though keeping the racist mindset (see van Dijk, 2008). It was also found that more teachers than students in percentage shed favor for Outer Circle English language teachers whereas NESTs with a Chinese pedigree received more support from the students (see Tables 5.7 and 5.8). Regarding the first finding, it may be considered related to those teachers’ experiences with Outer Circle teachers and Outer Circle English. After all, teachers as an entirety have more overseas experiences than students. As for the latter, it may have to do with students’ (immature) belief that NESTs with a Chinese pedigree know about Chinese culture.

In addition, a certain percent of the students and teachers chose the “Not sure” answer to the Likert scale items (see Section 5.2). This may represent the judgmental attitude of those participants, who might have perceived the respective professional (de)merits of these two categories of teachers. For example, some teacher interviewees, such as TI-2, considered personal character an important determinant of instructional style (see Section 5.2.2). This type of choice may demonstrate their possessing no knowledge on this issue, displaying therefore the central tendency bias, namely, choosing the middle point answer to a Likert scale question with an odd number of options (e.g., Chan, 2017;

Stening & Everett, 1984). It is noted that these explanations as well as the tentative interpretations of other interesting findings require validations by future research.

Based on the findings presented and discussed in this chapter, it is obvious that the three participant groups as a whole succumbed to Native-speakerism. They regarded NESTs, particularly Anglo-American Caucasian teachers, as the owners of English and expert English language teachers while denying the professional value of NNESTs, particularly Chinese EFL teachers. Observed from the sociocultural and historical-political perspective, the pro-nativeness mentality of the participants should not be viewed merely as an academic issue. Rather, it is a joint product of historical-present Sino-Western power disparity and the governance of EFL education executed by Chinese government. The Native-speakerist tradition in global ELT also contributes its share to the formation of the pro-nativeness mindset within these ELT stakeholders. In addition, intergroup differences as well as some interesting findings were discovered. Presented in the following chapters are the viewpoints of these three participant groups on the three other thematic aspects of ELT to do with English language varieties, cultural orientations, and teaching approaches respectively.

## **Chapter 6 Perceptions of Different English Language Varieties**

### **6.1 Introduction**

Chapter 5 analyzes the attitudes of the three participant groups – students, teachers and administrators – toward English language teachers from different L1 backgrounds. Chapter 6 explores the perceptions of the three groups on different English language varieties as well as intergroup (dis)similarities, therefore providing answers to Research Question 2 and part of Research Question 5.

Findings to do with these two questions are presented and discussed in this chapter. Section 6.2 deals with the opinions of the participants on the relative status of different English language varieties. Followed in Section 6.3 is the analysis of their perceptions of whose/which English language variety should be adopted as the learning/teaching reference or target. Section 6.4 dissects their viewpoints on whether it articulates a type of linguistic imperialism or linguistic discrimination to prioritize Inner Circle English over Outer and Expanding Circle English in ELT. In analyzing the data appertaining to these issues, intergroup (dis)similarities in perception were compared. The chapter concludes with a discussion and summary of the major findings presented in the preceding sections.

### **6.2 Opinions on the relative status of different English language varieties**

The opinions of the three participant groups on the relative status of different English language varieties can be observed from their understandings of whose/which English is of high(er) quality in linguistic and sociolinguistic terms. Quantitative data were collected through related Likert scale statements used in the questionnaire surveys (Items 1-4 for students; Items 11, 12, 13 and 17 for teachers) whereas the qualitative were gathered by means of relevant question items adopted in interviews (Item 1 for students; Items 1-3 for teachers; Items 6-7 for administrators). Data analysis suggests that the three participant groups as a whole granted more merits to Inner Circle English, contending that it is (more) standard, authentic and intelligible.

### 6.2.1 Inner Circle English as (more) standard English

Of the four Likert scale questions (Items 1-4) focusing on students' viewpoints about the relative status of different English language varieties, two (Items 3-4) are targeted at exploring their perceptions of which/whose English is more standard. Descriptive statistics in relation to these two items is summarized in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Student participants' perceptions of whose/which English is more standard

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 3. Compared with that of EFL countries (e.g., China), the English language of native English speaking countries is more standard.	6.6%	9.2%	21.7%	34.3%	28.3%	3.68	1.128
Item 4. Of the English language varieties of different countries, I think that of native English speaking countries is the most standard.	4.9%	10.8%	21.5%	38.1%	27.7%	3.70	1.129
Total	3.3%	6.5%	18.8%	40.8%	30.6%	3.69	1.138

Notes: N = 817; EFL = English as a foreign language; SD = standard deviation

Observed from the statistics in the table, most of the students regarded Inner Circle English as being more standard than all the other English varieties. This is evident from the mean for this question cluster ( $3.69 \pm 1.038$ ). It is also apparent from the percentile distribution. To be specific, an average of 71.4% of the students expressed (strong) agreement on that Inner English is more standard than other English language varieties; only 9.8% indicated oppositions. Interestingly, 18.8% were found displaying a "Not sure" stance.

Of the four Likert scale questions for teachers, Item 11 focuses on their opinions about the StE issue. Data collected through this item is reported in statistics in Table 6.2.

Precisely, half of the teacher participants (50%) regarded Inner Circle English as StE, in contrast to those (17.7%) who held an opposite position. This pro-nativeness stance is also represented by the mean ( $3.49 \pm 1.015$ ). Notably, about one third of the teachers (32.4%) selected the "Not sure" answer.

Table 6.2 Teachers' perceptions about whose/which English is more standard

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 11. The English language of native English speaking countries is more standard than that of the nonnative counterparts.	1.5%	16.2%	32.4%	32.4%	17.6%	3.49	1.015

Notes: N = 68; SD = standard deviation

The difference in mean between the students ( $3.69 \pm 1.038$ ) and teachers ( $3.49 \pm 1.015$ ) seems to indicate that the former group were more supportive of Inner Circle English as StE. Nevertheless, the results of the Independent Samples t-test shown in Table 6.3 suggest that it bears no statistical significance ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $d = 0.18$ ).

Table 6.3 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers on whose/which English is more standard

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	1.577	883	0.115	0.20	0.18
3.69	1.138	3.49	1.015					

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen's d

The statistics presented above suggest that most of the students and teachers considered Inner Circle English more standard than the other English varieties. This pro-nativeness stance becomes more evident with the analysis of their responses to related questions in interviews. During the interviews, the students were asked directly whether Inner Circle English is more standard, authentic and intelligible (Item 1). The teachers were asked about their opinions on the current scholarly argument that “*English is no longer the property of native English speakers*” (Item 1), “*the relative positions of different English varieties*” (Item 2) and “*the status of China English*” (Item 3).

Data analysis reveals that 88.5% (23) of the 26 students granted merits to Inner Circle English, contending that Inner Circle English is StE or more standard than any other English language variety. When justifying this standpoint, many participants (e.g., SI-19, TI-2, TI-12) resorted to the construct of grammaticality. As SI-19 put it,



With English as the native language, native English speaking countries have the authoritative resources of the English language. *The grammar* [of their English] *is surely more precise and standard*. However, the English language of nonnative English speaking countries is transmitted from native English speaking countries. In the process of transmission, it is inevitable for English to collide with or to be integrated with local languages. *An idiosyncratic way of speaking English with local characteristics* is thereby formed. *It is ungrammatical* (SI-19; Emphasis added)

In this excerpt, SI-19 polarized Inner Circle English and English language varieties of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries. This is represented in the linguistic forms that convey contradictory meanings. While claiming that the former has a “*more precise and standard*” grammar system, he described the latter as “*an idiosyncratic way of speaking English with local characteristics*”. Implied by this word, “*idiosyncratic*”, Outer and Expanding Circle English is, at the best, nothing but a hybrid fossilized with L1 characteristics due to the cross-linguistic influence and therefore ungrammatical. In the words of Quirk (1990), they are simply a “half backed quackery” (p. 9).

85.7% (12) of the 14 teacher interviewees maintained the same or similar viewpoint. In justifying their argument that Anglo-American English “*is more rigorous in terms of grammar*”, they tended to resort to concrete linguistic examples in relation to English language output of Chinese English learners or users – China English if it is an appropriate term. For instance,

I think that *British or American English is more rigorous in terms of grammar*. As to the English language of Chinese English learners, *grammatical rules run freely*. This phenomenon is mainly reflected in their using English. When learning English, they follow the grammatical rules [of British English or American English], but when using English, grammatical rules are transformed. For example, when expressing [the idea of] “I eat something” or “what we ate for breakfast this morning”, textbooks generally present “*I had breakfast in the morning*”. However, students usually say, “*I ate breakfast in the morning*”. In fact, this represents the penetration of Chinese language habits into English. I think this kind of [expressions] is understandable and can’t be regarded as a mistake. It can only be said to be less or not standard. *I still believe British or American English is more grammatical*. (TI-12; Emphasis added)

Using the “*breakfast*” example, TI-12 attempted to prove that the grammatical rules of China English “*run freely*”, therefore lending support conversely to her argument for the grammatical rigorousness of Anglo-American English. Although this example – a case of pragmatic grammar – may not be appropriate in terms of the traditional morphological and syntactic grammar, the following examples she raised regarding the pluralization of some noun words can illustrate better her argument.

To take the pluralization of basic noun words as an example, it is hard to understand why some noun words are unaccountable according to the rules of the English language, such as broccoli, chocolate and hair, which are, however, countable in Chinese. Therefore, students are likely to make mistakes at this point. (TI-12)

Implied in the remarks of TI-12, Anglo-American English is the benchmark or yardstick against which other English language varieties should be measured. Other interviewees, such as SI-2, TI-4 or TI-8, adopted the same logic in arguing for the ungrammaticality of Outer and Expanding Circle English. They regarded deviations from Inner Circle English as mistakes rather than linguistic innovations (see Kachru, 1992a).

The perceptions of the eight program administrators about the relative status of different English language varieties can be observed from their responses to Question Item 6 (*There is a voice in the academia claiming that China English is also Standard English. What is your opinion about it?*) and Item 7 (*In your opinion, why do many people only regard British and American English as Standard English?*).

According to the data, all of the administrators asserted that Inner Circle English, inter alia, Anglo-American English, is StE. Compared in percentage with the overall attitudinal tendency of the students and teachers discovered through the questionnaire surveys (see Tables 6.1 and 6.2), it seems that the administrators were more convinced about the superiority of Inner Circle English. Their pro-nativeness stance is represented exactly by the discursive strategies and linguistic forms in their remarks. For instance,

[...] as far as China English is concerned, it *is not StE*. The English varieties in South East Asia *are not either*. In fact, except that British and American English *can be called StE*, I think, the English varieties of other countries or regions *cannot be said to be StE*. They [nonnative English speakers] only take English as *a communication tool*, with which to conduct communications and achieve communicative goals ... *to achieve communicative goals with English*. (A-5; Emphasis added)

In this comment, A-5 stated with unmodified predicates that Chinese English as well as South East Asian English varieties “*is not StE*”. By contrast, he stated affirmatively that only Anglo-American English “*can be called StE*”. In his view, NNS English or Outer and Expanding Circle English only plays a role of an expedient “*communication tool*” or serves as a performative variety, like Pidgin English. Other administrators

expressed similar viewpoints. As with many students and teachers, they realized the indigenization of the English language, but considered the indigenized forms a sign of ungrammaticality. In making the judgment, they also upheld the grammatical rules of Inner Circle English as the benchmark. This is evident in the remarks of A-1, “*These changes are ungrammatical in terms of the grammatical rules of the StE*”.

The excerpts cited above shed light on a strong support of Inner Circle as being StE among the interviewees. This is evident in the words and expressions they adopted to describe different English language varieties. These findings complement to a great degree the statistical discoveries achieved through the questionnaire surveys. Despite the general pro-nativeness attitudinal tendency among the three participant groups, certain statistical information seems to show that the administrators granted more support to Inner Circle English.

#### 6.2.2 Inner Circle English as (more) authentic English

Whether Inner Circle English is regarded as being (more) authentic is another concern of this study. Presented as follows are the findings in accordance to the quantitative and qualitative data collected.

The Likert scale question (Item 2) in the questionnaire for students is targeted at finding out their opinions on the authenticity issue. According to the statistics collected (see Table 6.4), the majority of the students (65.2%) expressed (strong) agreement on that Inner Circle English is more authentic than Outer Circle English. This stance is also represented by the mean ( $3.73 \pm 1.176$ ). By contrast, an average of 15% of the students expressed oppositions. It was also found that 18.7% chose the “Not sure” answer.

Table 6.4: Student participants’ perceptions of whose/which English is more authentic

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 2. Compared with that of ESL countries (e.g., India), the English language of native English speaking countries is more authentic.	6.5%	9.5%	18.7%	35.0%	30.2%	3.73	1.176

Notes: N = 817; ESL = English as a second language; SD = standard deviation

The opinions of teacher participants is evident in their responses to Question Item 17. Indicated by the statistics reported in Table 6.5, 60.3% of the teachers depreciated Outer Circle English as being inauthentic, with the mean reaching 3.65 (1.176). Only 16.2% expressed “disagreement” on this Likert scale statement but no one indicated “strong disagreement”. Conversely, these numerical figures are suggestive of a strong pro-nativeness stance. It is noted that about one-fourth (23.5%) chose the “Not sure” answer.

Table 6.5 Teacher participants’ perceptions of whose/which English is authentic (N=68)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 17. The English language of ESL countries is inauthentic. (reversed)	0.0%	16.2%	23.5%	39.7%	20.6%	3.65	0.989

Notes: N = 68; ESL = English as a second language; SD = standard deviation

The statistics reported in Tables 6.4 and 6.5 reveals a similar attitudinal tendency among the students and teachers. However, the difference in average mean seems to show that the student group were more supportive of Inner Circle English. Nevertheless, the results of Independent Samples t-test reported in Table 6.6 suggest that the statistical difference between the two groups is of no significance ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $d = 0.07$ ).

Table 6.6 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers on whose/which English is (more) authentic

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.73	1.176	3.65	0.989	0.562	883	0.575	0.082	0.07

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen’s d

The analysis of the data gathered through interviews with the students and teachers illuminates their pro-nativeness mentality to a greater depth, as it reveals not only the subtlety of their opinions on different English language varieties, but, more importantly, the logic they followed in justifying their positions during the interviews. Indicated by data analysis, 65.4% (17) of the 26 students and 64.3% (9) of the 14 teachers asserted that Inner Circle English is of authenticity and justified this standpoint by resorting

mainly to the notion about the historical trajectory of the English language. Namely, Inner Circle English is the source from which other English varieties are derived and therefore it has witnessed a longer historical existence. It is evident that a hierarchical relationship between Inner Circle English and the other English varieties existed in the depth of their mind. This is represented by the discursive strategies, particularly the predicative strategy and linguistic forms in their remarks.

Suggested by the data, most of the 17 student interviewees adopted metaphorical words and expressions that evoke the sense of historical authority, such as “*mother*”, “*origin*”, “*source*” or “*root*”, to describe Inner Circle English or Inner Circle countries. As SI-13 put it, “*As the earliest English users, native English speaking countries use the English language variety that retains the original flavor of English; their English is the mother of other Englishes.*” By contrast, Outer and Expanding Circle English were described either explicitly or implicitly as “*less authoritative*” or “*transformed English*” on the claim that “*Inner Circle countries are the birthplace of the English language*” (SI-18; SI-7) and the inhabitants there “*invented English and have been using this language*” (SI-20). Represented exactly in these words and expressions is their firm belief in the authentic status of Inner Circle English.

The “*root-branch*” or “*source-derivative*” metaphor is also of high frequency in the comments made by the teachers on the relationship of Inner Circle English and the other English varieties. For instance,

They [the native English speakers] use their language, but we remold it by adding our own elements when using it. The only thing is that *the origin of the English language lies in their [country]*. That is, *no matter how hard we learn English*, [we have to remember that] *the ultimate root of this language is in their country*. (TI-4; Emphasis added)

It is obvious that the two metaphorical words in TI-4’s remarks, “*origin*” and “*root*” contribute to the historical authority and authenticity of Inner Circle English. The line “*no matter how hard we learn English*” implies that China English or the English output of Chinese EFL users can never match Inner Circle English, for a simple reason that “*the ultimate root of this language*” is in Inner Circle countries. This “*root*” or “*origin*” reasoning is also evident in the rhetoric of TI-2, who asserted that Outer and Expanding Circle English varieties are just branches of Inner Circle English or at the

most “*derivatives from NS English*”.

English in these countries, such as India, a former colony of Great Britain, is used in school education. However, it is not normative as far as the English language itself is concerned. *It can only be said to be a derivative from NS English*. I only feel that English is an orthodox language belonging to Great Britain and America. *This transformed English is just a branch [...]* (TI-2; Emphasis added)

The “root-branch” or “*source-derivative*” metaphor in the above excerpts illustrates the perceived hierarchical structure in the family of Englishes and the degree to which different English language varieties are authentic. It also implies the historical duration of different English varieties. This perspective is obvious in the comments by some teachers on the authenticity of Inner Circle English. For example, in the eyes of TI-8, Britain is the origin of English and it is logically a “*conventional*” English speaking country. America was viewed in the same way by TI-11. By “conventional”, it means that Anglo-American English has witnessed a long historical existence and therefore possesses a solid historical validity. This reasoning can help to explain why most of the teachers granted an authentic status to Inner Circle English.

As with the unanimous agreement on Inner Circle English as StE, the administrators all granted the status of authenticity to Inner Circle English. Compared in percentage with the students and teachers in support of the Inner Circle English during the questionnaire surveys (see Tables 6.4 and 6.5), the administrators seemed to hold a stronger pro-nativeness attitude.

The administrators also resorted to the “*origin*” or “*birthplace*” metaphor and its related historicity to justify the authenticity to Anglo-American English. In their view, Britain and America are “*the birthplace of English*” and have “*a long history*” in using this language. Therefore, Anglo-American English are more genuine than any other English language variety. Exemplified below is the comment made by A-7.

As for British English, [the birthplace] is Britain; in terms of American English, of course it is America. This is generally agreed upon, this criterion ... After all *they are the first* [to use English], *and the birthplace of English* ... [Anglo-American English] *has a long history*, I think they are authentic. (A-7; Emphasis added)

All the excerpts cited above in this subsection shed light on a strong support of Inner

English as authentic English by most interviewees. This is represented exactly in the polarizing metaphorical words or phrases they adopted to describe Inner Circle English versus the other English varieties. Observed from these findings as well as the strong pro-nativeness attitudinal tendency among the participants in the questionnaire surveys, it can be said that the three participant groups as a whole were convinced about the authenticity of Inner Circle English.

### 6.2.3 Inner Circle English as (more) intelligible English

In addition to investigating the viewpoints of the three stakeholder groups regarding which English variety is (more) standard and authentic, their opinions on whether Inner Circle English is (more) intelligible was also explored. Findings are presented as follows.

Data collected from student participants through the Likert scale question (Item 1) is summarized in Table 6.7. Suggested by the mean value ( $3.56 \pm 1.286$ ), the majority of the students regarded Inner Circle English as being more intelligible than Outer Circle English. This pro-nativeness attitudinal propensity is also represented in the percentage (60.9%) for the students in (strong) agreement on this Likert scale statement. In terms of statistics, this stance agrees with that displayed by most of the students in support of Inner Circle English as being (more) standard and authentic (see Tables 6.1 and 6.4). However, 20.8% and 18.2% of the students expressed disagreement and a “Not sure” stance on this statement respectively.

Table 6.7 Student participants’ perceptions of whose/which English is more intelligible

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 1. Compared with that of ESL countries (e.g., India), the English language of native English speaking countries is more intelligible.	11.3%	9.5%	18.2%	34.0%	26.9%	3.56	1.286

Notes: N = 817; ESL = English as a second language; SD = standard deviation

Likewise, a strong pro-nativeness attitudinal tendency was found within the teacher group. This is evident from the statistics (Table 6.8) collected through a Likert scale

question (Item 12). Precisely, 61.7% of the teachers asserted that Outer and Expanding Circle English is difficult to understand, implying conversely the superiority of Inner Circle English in intelligibility. The pro-nativeness attitude is also reflected in the mean ( $3.72 \pm 1.091$ ). By contrast, only 14.7% of the teachers indicated oppositions. It is noted that about a quarter (23.5%) of the participants selected the “Not sure” answer.

Table 6.8 Teacher participants’ perceptions of the intelligibility of NNS English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 12. The English language of nonnative English speaking countries is difficult to understand. (reversed)	2.9%	11.8%	23.5%	33.8%	27.9%	3.72	1.091

Notes: N = 68; SD = standard deviation

Despite the similarity in attitudinal tendency between these two groups, the difference in mean seems to show that the teacher group were more positive toward Inner Circle English. However, the results of the Independent Samples t-test (Table 6.6) indicate that no statistical significance ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $d = 0.13$ ) stays with the mean difference.

Table 6.9 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers about the intelligibility of different English varieties

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.56	1.286	3.72	1.091	1.163	83.313	0.248	0.162	0.13

Note: df = degree of freedom; d =Cohen’s d

The analysis of the qualitative data collected through interview indicates that 69.2% (18) of the 26 students and 85.7% (12) of the 14 teachers granted support to Inner Circle English, asserting that it is (more) intelligible. The polarization of Inner Circle English and the other English varieties is represented by linguistic forms that convey a strong Self versus Other ideology.

Of the 18 students in support of Inner Circle English, eight (e.g., SI-4; SI-16; SI-25) stated no special reasons except that English originates from Inner Circle countries and



therefore their English is more intelligible. In addition to this line of thought, the ten others (e.g., SI-1; SI-7; SI-12; SI-18) resorted to the construct of L1 phonological transfer, emphasizing that the English language varieties other than Inner Circle English are imbued with L1 accent or pronunciation features and are then difficult to understand. As SI-1 stated, “*it is difficult to discern the pronunciation of the English language of nonnative English speaking countries because it carries some local accents or pronunciation characteristics of those countries*”. Some of them considered the influence of local accents a sign of “*countryside English*” (SI-16), which lacks “*wide-range applicability*” (SI-7).

The negative attitudes of the students toward Outer and Expanding Circle English with respect to its intelligibility and the associated applicability scope found their echoes in the comments by the 12 teachers. As TI-1 stated,

*The English varieties in ESL countries, such as Indian English, which has a heavy accent, are very difficult to understand. They don't fit in well with the [function] of a communicative medium that what we understand a language should perform. [We] need a unitary reference standard, which, in my opinion, should be British or American English.* (TI-1; Emphasis added)

In this excerpt, TI-1 seemed to consider the low intelligibility of Outer Circle English a matter-of-fact manner. This mentality is represented in his adopting the present-tense declarative sentence structure with the exemption of hedging words. It is also reflected by words and expressions representing the (de)merits he assigned to different English language varieties. For example, while denying the function of Indian English as “*a communicative medium*”, he granted Anglo-American English a prestige of absolute intelligibility – realized linguistically as “*a unitary reference standard*”.

Other teachers also expressed this stance. For instance, TI-6 stated that “*Not all Indian English can be understood and get across so quickly*” whereas Anglo-American English was asserted to be “*understood by others very quickly*” in a wide range of communicative contexts. As she further commented,

*Indian English has its own limitations. Its pronunciation, for example, is characterized with the accents of the local languages of India, and is not always understood so easily in other countries. Not all Indian English can be understood and get across so quickly. However, if it is British or American English, it will be understood by others very*

*quickly ... people are willing to speak British or American English, because they can be understood by more others. If I had learned Indian English, it would be hard for others to understand me. (TI-6; Italicized, my emphasis)*

As with the unanimous support of Inner Circle English as being (more) standard and authentic, the eight administrators all contended that Inner Circle English is (more) intelligible due to its standard pronunciation and can function in a wide range of communication contexts. In terms of percentage, the administrators seemed more inclined to support Inner Circle English than the students and teachers participating in the questionnaire surveys (see also Table 6.7 and 6.8).

In addition to making macro comments on the intelligibility of Inner Circle English as most students and teachers did, the administrators resorted to concrete examples or made analogies to elaborate on this stance. The narrative of A-3 seems more interesting. She resorted to her personal experiences in America to prove the low intelligibility that NNS English is claimed to possess.

In the United States, many professors working at universities come from different parts of the world. For example, one of my teachers comes from Columbia. It is so difficult to understand his English. *When he delivered a lecture, I had to listen to him with my ears up.* It was really hard ... *But when listening to American English, I felt much more comfortable.* (A-3; Emphasis added)

In this narration, A-3's hard experience with the Columbian accent is represented in her exaggerating expression "*with my ears up*". However, she "*felt much more comfortable*" with American English. Normally, these two phrases can evoke contradicting sensual and emotional reactions, which in turn represent and justify her pro-nativeness stance.

When arguing for the intelligibility of Inner Circle English and its associated wide-range applicability, A-8 resorted to the language landscape in mainland China.

It is just like Chinese language. *Putonghua* [or Standard Mandarin Chinese] is the Standard Chinese. Varieties, such as Sichuan Dialect, Tianjin Dialect etc. cannot count as Standard Chinese ... [Likewise,] Finish English can't count as StE. It is absolutely not StE. The NS English is the StE. (A-8)

In this excerpt, A-8 compared Inner Circle English to *Putonghua*, but Outer and Expanding Circle English to local dialects in different geographical regions of China.

Asserted to have a clear pronunciation, *Putonghua* is promulgated as Standard Chinese by the central government of China. Currently, it has been widely accepted in mainland China. By contrast, local dialects are only used in a small social and geographic area due to their local accents. When making this analogy, he seemed to be unaware of the socio-political factors that drive the promotion of *Putonghua* in China.

As stated above, the vast majority of the interviewees upheld Inner Circle English as being (more) intelligible while deeming Outer and Expanding Circle English difficult to understand and limited in application scope due to the interference of L1 phonological elements. It seems that the administrators granted more support to Inner Circle English than the other two groups. These findings agree with those presented in the preceding subsections (Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2). It can therefore be concluded that a pro-nativeness tendency prevailed among the three participant groups. Notably, a certain percent of the students and teachers chose the “Not sure” answer when attending the questionnaire surveys. Although the findings are reported under these three thematic titles – standard, authenticity, and intelligibility, this does not mean that there is a clear-cut boundary between these three constructs. In fact, they constitute a triadic ideological scale with which to weigh, in this study, the opinions of the participants on different English language varieties.

### **6.3 Whose/which English to learn/teach**

Inferred from the findings presented in the above section, most of the participants may uphold Inner Circle English as the learning/teaching reference and target. However, it is possible that the support of Inner Circle English does not agree with what they themselves expect to learn/teach due to the influence of certain contextual or personal factors. This section presents and discusses the findings in relation to this issue.

#### **6.3.1 The ideal English language variety**

The ideal learning reference and target for the student participants is observable from their responses to two Likert scale questions (Items 5 and 6) and two semi-open multiple-choice items (Items 24 and 26). The former are targeted at locating their views on the linguistic, particularly phonological norms than one needs to take as reference

in learning English; the latter are intended to investigate whose/which English language they themselves expect to learn (Item 26) and what type of English pronunciation they prefer to acquire (Item 24).

Suggested by the statistical data collected through the two Likert scale questions (Table 6.10), most of the students maintained that one should follow NS linguistic and phonological norms in learning English. This is evident from the mean for this question cluster ( $3.56 \pm 0.972$ ) and the average percentage (65.8%) for the students in support of following NS norms. Only 10.1% expressed oppositions, but almost a quarter (24.1%) selected the “Not sure” answer.

Table 6.10 Students’ perceptions of NS norms with regard to learning English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 5. To learn English well, learners need to follow the language norms of NSs.	6.1%	7.6%	28.3%	37.5%	20.6%	3.59	1.084
Item 6. To learn English well, learners need to imitate the pronunciation of NSs.	5.3%	13.0%	25.5%	35.5%	20.8%	3.54	1.114
Total	2.7%	7.4%	24.1%	44.5%	21.3%	3.56	0.972

Notes: N = 817; NSs = native speakers; SD = standard deviation

Whether Inner Circle English is taken as their own learning target can be seen from their responses to Item 26, a question that provides for choice three types of English language varieties – Varieties A, B and C – representing Inner Circle English, Outer Circle English and China English respectively. According to the statistics reported in Table 6.11, 67.9% (555) of the students expressed a desire to acquire Inner Circle English. By contrast, 20.0% (163) indicated a preference for China English and only 12.1% (99) for Outer Circle English.

Table 6.11 Students’ perceptions of the ideal English language variety to learn

Item 26. Of English varieties A/B/C, which one do you expect most to learn?	A	B	C	Total
Students (N=817)	67.9% (555)	12.1% (99)	20.0% (163)	100%

Whether student participants upheld NS pronunciation as their own learning target can be observed from their answers to Question Item 24. To be specific, this question provides for choice four types of students with dissimilar English pronunciation profiles. Student A is almost indistinguishable from a NS in pronunciation; Student B is close to a NS in pronunciation; Student C speaks English clearly, is easy to be understood, but bears a visible Chinese accent; Student D has a heavy Chinese accent, which, however, does not constitute an obstacle for his/her communication with (non)native English speakers.

The statistics reported in Table 6.12 indicates that the vast majority of the students upheld NS pronunciation as their own learning target. This is represented in percentile distribution. Specifically, 74.5% (608) of the students expressed a desire to emulate Students A and B, namely, to acquire NS or NS-like pronunciation. By contrast, only 17.9% expressed no concern about a visible Chinese accent and an almost ignorable percent of the students did not mind speaking English with a heavy Chinese accent.

Table 6.12 Students' perceptions of the ideal English pronunciation to acquire

Item 24. Of Students A/B/C/D, which one do you expect most to be?	A	B	C	D	Total
Students (N=817)	44.6% (364)	29.9% (244)	17.9% (146)	7.7% (63)	100%

As regards the teachers, the Likert scale question (Item 13) is intended to solicit their opinions on whose English language standard that a teacher should follow in teaching English; the two semi-open multiple-choice questions (Items 31 and 29) parallel Items 26 and 24 for students in content.

Table 6.13 summarizes in statistics the data collected through the Likert scale question. Observed from the statistics, an overall pro-nativeness attitudinal tendency seemed to exist among the teachers. This is represented by the mean ( $3.54 \pm 0.871$ ), which is almost the same as that ( $3.57 \pm 0.897$ ) for the student group (see Table 6.10). It is also apparent from the percentage (50%) for the teachers who expressed (strong) agreement on this statement. Surprisingly, about 40% of the teachers selected the "Not sure" answer, 10% higher than the students who made the same choice (see Table 6.10). At the same time,

none of the teachers chose the “strong disagreement” answer.

Table 6.13 Teachers’ perceptions of the NS language standard in teaching English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 13. The English language standard of native English speaking countries should be followed English language teaching.	0%	10.3%	39.7%	35.3%	14.7%	3.54	0.871

Notes: N = 68; ELT = English language teaching; SD = standard deviation

The similarity in average mean regarding this issue between the students and the teachers was verified through an Independent Samples t-test, the results of which presented in the following table suggest that the mean difference between the two groups bears no statistical significance ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $d = 0.02$ ).

Table 6.14 Independent Samples t-test of the perceptions of students and teachers on NS norms in learning/teaching English

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.56	0.972	3.54	0.871	1.169	883	0.243	0.021	0.02

Notes: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen’s d

Item 31 was intended to solicit the opinions of teachers on whose/which English they expect their students to learn. The statistics reported in Table 6.15 suggests a strong pro-nativeness attitude among the teachers. To be specific, 50.0% (34) of the teachers selected Variety A, Inner Circle English; little favor was given to Outer Circle English. Interestingly, 39.7% (27) chose Variety C, China English, which is higher than the percentage (20%) for the students expressing the same preference (see Table 6.11).

Table 6.15 Teachers’ perceptions of the ideal English language variety for their students to learn

Item 31. Of English varieties A/B/C, which one do you expect most your students to learn?	A	B	C	Total
Teachers (N=68)	50.0% (34)	10.3% (7)	39.7% (27)	100%

Regarding the pronunciation target, the statistics reported in Table 6.16 indicates that 78% (53) of the teachers expected their students to acquire NS or NS-like pronunciation. This is aligned with the overall learning orientation regarding this issue within the student group. Nevertheless, this pro-nativeness finding among the teachers stays in sharp contrast to their unneglectable endorsement for China English (see Table 6.15) and to their “Not sure” stance on following the NS standard in teaching English (see Table 6.13). This controversy warrants further studies.

Table 6.16 Teachers’ perceptions of the ideal English pronunciation for their students to acquire

Item 29. Of Students A/B/C/D, which one do you expect most your students to be?	A	B	C	D	Total
Teachers (N=68)	47.1% (32)	30.9% (21)	14.7% (10)	7.4% (5)	100%

The opinions of the eight administrators on this issue can be seen from their responses to Question Item 8 (*As a program administrator, do you require the teachers of your division or department to teach a certain English variety?*).

When answering this question during interviews, all of the administrators stated that they do not require their fellow teachers to teach a certain English variety, particularly Inner Circle English, and pose no related requirement for their students. However, a pro-nativeness mindset was found reverberating underneath this liberal claim. As A-5 stated, “*it is the ultimate objective to teach British or American English*”. This mentality is also apparent in the mind of A-8. Although claiming that “*English is just a tool of communication*”, he stated that “*we need to follow this [NS] standard, which is what we pursue*”. It is evident that in the innermost part of his mind, Inner Circle English is the learning ideal. As he put it at length,

I often tell my fellow teacher that the concept of learning English is changing. It may be comparatively strict if we are required to teach English according to the [English language] standard of English speaking countries. *Well, we need follow this standard, which is what we pursue.* But it doesn’t matter if we are not able to reach this standard. [If thinking in this way], you will not feel our English is worse than theirs. If feeling the English we speak does not reach NS standard, students will be afraid of speaking English. This will affect the efficiency of our language learning. *English is just a tool of communication.* (A-8; Emphasis added)

Based on the findings presented in this subsection, it is obvious that most of the students and teachers upheld Inner Circle English, particularly NS pronunciation as the learning/teaching reference and target. Although the administrators posed no explicit requirement for their teachers and students to follow NS norms, it does not indicate that they held a pluralistic viewpoint on the English language. Notably, a liberal attitude toward China English seemed to have emerged among some students and teachers, particularly among the latter. In addition, a certain percent of the students and teachers displayed a “Not sure” stance regarding whether a person should follow NS norms in learning English and this seemed more pronounced among the teachers.

### 6.3.2 Positionality justifications

Justifications expressed by the three participant groups for their stances on the macro reference model and concrete learning/teaching target are evident from the qualitative data. They were collected through the paralleled semi-open multi-choice questions for students (Items 24 and 26) and teachers (Items 31 and 29) as well as related questions utilized in interviews with teachers (Items 1-3) and administrators (Items 6 and 7).

Of the reasons stated by the students and teachers for their support of Inner Circle English as the reference and target, those shared between the two groups and the group specific coexist. In terms of the former, the predominant one resides in the assumed linguistic superiority of Inner Circle English (see also Section 6.2).

To be specific, 53.7% (298) of the 555 students in support of learning Inner Circle English supplied reasons (Item 26; see Table 6.12). Of the 298 students, 74.2% (221) contended that Inner Circle English is “*authentic*” (e.g., S-100, S-159 or S-302), “*pure*” (e.g., S-40, S-190 or S-326), “*of original flavor*” (e.g., S-123, S-500, S-731) and “*veritable*” (e.g., S-178, S-205, S-670). Of the 608 students who selected NS or NS-like pronunciation as the learning target (Item 24; see Table 6.12), 50% (304) justified their stances. Reasons provided by 57.2% (174) of the 304 students are similar to those articulated by the 221 students. Many students also stated that the acquisition of NS or NS-like pronunciation symbolizes the success in learning English (e.g., S-87, S-264 or S-736).



Of the 34 teachers who expected their students to learn Inner Circle English (Item 31; see Table 6.15), 67.6% (23) stated reasons. Data analysis reveals that similar positive words and expression were adopted to describe Inner Circle English. As T-6 stated, “*This type of English [the NS English] is comparatively normative and there is no accent with it [and] I hope my students to learn veritable English*”. Those teachers also resorted to the application scope of Inner Circle English to justify taking it as the learning/teaching target. In the words of TI-1, “*The influence and coverage of the new varieties [Outer and Expanding Circle English] are far constrained than British or American English*” (TI-1). These perspectives reverberated among 73.6% (39) of the 53 teachers who expressed the desire for their students to acquire NS or NS-like pronunciation (Item 29; see Table 6.16).

In addition, many teacher interviewees turned to the prevalence of Inner Circle English in EFL pedagogical materials and their personal English learning experiences to illustrate their endorsement for Inner Circle English and NS pronunciation.

As for pedagogical materials, five teachers (TI-4, TI-5, TI-6, TI-8 and TI-12) asserted that current EFL textbooks and supplementary reading materials are edited in line with American English. As a corollary, Chinese EFL teachers have no choice but to follow American English norms. The effect of this status quo is represented in the rhetoric of TI-8, i.e., “*I am forced to*” and “*I am selected*”.

Our textbooks are oriented to American English. Furthermore, there are many EFL learning materials in the market, and I have listened to many recordings and listening comprehension materials. They are all written in American English. [I feel that] *I am forced to move close to this English [variety]. I am selected.* (TI-8; Emphasis added)

The comment of TI-8 represents the impact of the prevalence of American English on EFL pedagogical decisions. Other teachers attributed their endorsement for Inner Circle English as the teaching reference and objective to their early EFL learning experiences, which seems to prove the influence of the historical legitimacy of prioritizing Inner Circle English in ELT as well as the effects of the habitus fostered out of a person’s early lived experiences (Bourdieu, 1989). As TI-12 put it,

I would like to teach British English because we had been learning Standard British English since we started to receive EFL education. Therefore, it influences my later

EFL learning and teaching pronunciation and writing. *This is due to the habit formed in early days, which is difficult to change.* (TI-12; Emphasis added)

As stated in the preceding subsection, most of the administrators did not require their teachers and students to adhere to Inner Circle English norms. Reasons they stated are related to the general perspective on the macro objective of CE education in China and the professional qualities of their fellow Chinese EFL teachers.

In terms of objective of CE education, most of the administrators held an instrumentalist point of view. To be specific, non-English-major students only need to develop the ability to communicate with foreigners in English and it is of no necessity for them to follow NS norms. As A-5 put it,

For non-English-major students, we don't have such requirements [for following NS standard], that is, *we take the instrumental function as the basis and as the objective [...] it is fine if they can communicate with foreigners after leaving the university.* (A-5; Emphasis added)

In addition to the macro objective of CE education, the administrators resorted to the professional qualities of their fellow teachers to explain their raising no demand for following NS norms. In their view, it is impractical to pose such a requirement because most of their fellow teachers are less qualified in English proficiency. As A-2 put it,

Only a few universities can achieve this goal, such as Beijing Foreign Studies University, whose teachers can speak comparatively genuine British English. However, *teachers of my university and other ordinary universities [in China] have mixed English accents*, let alone to say their students. (A-2; Emphasis added)

In this excerpt, A-2 made a comparison between his fellow teachers and the faculty members of a prestigious language institute in China in respect of English proficiency. According to him, his fellow teachers as well as those of most other Chinese universities “*have mixed English accents*”, which he considered a sign of low proficiency in English. Similar negative words and expressions were adopted by other administrators to describe the English language output of their fellow teachers, such as “*unauthentic*”, “*Chinglish*”, “*blurred English*” (A-7) or “*unable to speak so authentic British or American English*” (A-6).

Observed from these two reasons, it becomes clear why most administrators raised no requirements for their fellow teachers and students to follow NS norms. In light of the pro-nativeness propensity in the innermost of their mind, their decision can be viewed as an expedient or a helpless choice.

What is presented in this section reveals that most of the participants upheld Inner Circle English as the learning/teaching proper. This mentality can be regarded as the logical outcome of their perception of Inner Circle English as being (more) standard, authentic and intelligible (see Section 6.2). It is also related to the endorsement for Inner Circle English in ELT tradition, such as the predominance of American English in ELT learning/teaching materials. In light of these findings as well as the current globalization of the English language and its attendant scholarship, a question is raised, namely, whether the three groups of stakeholders have come to realize that the prioritization of Inner Circle English in ELT entails discrimination against Outer and Expanding Circle English. Presented in the following section are the answers to this question.

#### **6.4 Awareness of linguistic discrimination**

The awareness of the linguistic discrimination among the three participant groups can be observed from the data that were collected through three of the questions employed in interviews (Item 2 for students; Item 4 for teachers; Item 9 for administrators). The three questions are almost the same in content. Data analysis reveals a prevalent denial of the discrimination, which is most evident among the students. Of those who provided affirmative answers, most considered the discrimination irresistible or inevitable.

Precisely, all of the 26 students, 64.3% (9) of the 14 teachers and 75% (6) of the eight administrators asserted that the prioritization of Inner Circle English in ELT entails no discrimination or prejudice against Outer and Expanding Circle English. In elaborating on this stance, most of them resorted to the superior merits that Inner Circle English has been assumed to possess as well as the attendant benefits for English learners, as they did in praising Inner Circle English as being (more) standard, authentic and intelligible (see also Section 6.2). This is evident from the discursive strategies and their linguistic realizations. As SI-25 stated,

I think the claim [that the promotion of Inner Circle English entails discrimination against other Englishes] is impartial. *To take the English language of native English speaking countries as the norm indicates respect both for the English language and for English language learning.* It entails no discrimination against the English varieties of [traditionally] nonnative English speaking countries. For these countries, the reason for referring to the English language of [traditionally] native English speaking countries lies in that *their English is more acceptable, more standard and intelligible. [It is] easier to understand* due to the correct pronunciation, and it can help to *avoid misunderstandings* out of mixed pronunciations. Your interlocutors can understand what you say exactly. However, since nonnative English speaking countries do not have a perfect understanding of the English language, *their English has many ambiguous expressions and is not convenient for communication.* (SI-25; Emphasis added)

The traditional dichotomy between Inner Circle English versus Outer and Expanding Circle English is represented explicitly in these remarks. For SI-25, it is linguistically correct and educationally sound to follow Inner Circle English. This is evident from “a hypothetical future” (Reyes, 2011, p. 786), namely, with NS pronunciation, “*it can help to avoid misunderstandings*” in communications (see also Sections 6.2 and 6.3). The firmness of her stance is evident from the present tense and the unmodified predicates she adopted.

Likewise, the nine teachers and six administrators followed these lines of thoughts to justify their support of Inner Circle English in ELT as the teaching model and learning target. In addition, the administrators resorted to the construct of personal freedom to deny the discrimination associated with the prioritization of Inner Circle English. For them, it is natural to learn the English variety that is of high quality. As A-3 put it,

*There is no discrimination or inequality.* If inequality exists, it depends on how you look at it ... So far as I am concerned, I prefer RP and GA accent to others. However, it doesn't mean that Singaporean English cannot be totally acceptable to the ear. This English variety, I don't hold prejudice against it. *It is just my personal preference.* For example, in terms of the communicative function, it should have the same value or value in use. But in terms of the aesthetic significance, I can't say the same about the accent of Singaporean English ... If I listen to VOA [Voice of America], I will feel it is *so beautiful, so beautiful* just “*like music*”. So when you listen to other English varieties, you will feel they are *sluggishly noisy, a very rough feeling.* (A-3; Emphasis added)

In this excerpt, A-3 justified this stance by resorting to the aesthetic appeal that Inner Circle English is claimed to possess (see also Section 6.2). Although the argument of “personal freedom” was also adopted, it can be exemplified more effectively with the

remarks of A-1. When asked whether the prioritization of Inner Circle English in ELT entails prejudice against other English language varieties, she responded with a definite “no”, and then elaborated on her stance by repeating several times the concept of “*personal preference*”.

*No, there is no discrimination. That I don't choose a variety does not mean I hold discrimination against it. I choose a variety because I like it. I only have more preference for it, but it has nothing to do with prejudice. I can choose any one from A, B, C and D. I choose the one with which I am satisfied. I choose the one that I like best. This does not mean that I am prejudiced against the one that I do not choose. That is what things are.* (A-1; Italicized, my emphasis)

Implied in her logic, everyone has the freedom to choose whatever English language variety to learn. However, she seemed to be unaware what sustains “*That is what things are*”. In other words, she seemed to accord no deep thought to why she decided to choose Inner Circle English, particularly what underlies her personal choice.

Although most of the interviewees denied the discrimination or prejudice against Outer and Expanding Circle English, the others provided affirmative answers but deemed it irresistible or inevitable. This viewpoint is evident in the responses of five teachers (TI-5, TI-6, TI-8, TI-9 and TI-10) and two administrators (A-6 and A-7), though they justified it from different perspectives.

T-10 traced the irresistibility or inevitability to the innate inequality of social structure. This is reflected in her paralleled “*I wish*” sentences in subjunctive mood as well as her state-of-the-fact statement that “*The society is unequal per se*”. As she stated,

So far as I am concerned, *I wish* they [different English language varieties] were put at the same foot. So long as they serve as a tool of communication, *I wish* they were equal ... However, English varieties are hierarchical ... These varieties reflect their respective cultural and economic background. *The society is unequal per se*. This inequality exists in cultural and economic areas. When the inequality appears in the form of language, *language will bear the imprint of economic and cultural factors*. For these reasons, some discrimination or racialized prejudice will be produced [out of the promotion of Inner Circle English]. (TI-10; Emphasis added)

If the “*irresistibility*” or “*inevitability*” is related to the innate economic and cultural imparity of human society, the socio-economic and socio-cultural hegemony of the English speaking West, in history and at present, may explain in part why Inner Circle

English is upheld as the learning/teaching reference and target in ELT. This logic is observable in the remarks of A-4.

People tend to think that Britain is the origin of the English language, Oxford and Cambridge [universities] represent the highest academic achievement [in the world], and the “noble families” in Britain are admirable. At the same time, America, as the largest economy in the world, has the gigantic influence on the world by its culture. At present, its economic and cultural influence cannot be matched by any other country. (A-4)

The irresistibility is reinforced in many social practices where RP or GA pronunciation plays the gate-keeping role. TI-5 illustrated it with some concrete cases to do with different types of English pronunciation.

I think they [different English varieties] are not treated fairly. Sometimes, for example, when there is a speech contest or an examination for selecting news anchors, it is impossible [for you to succeed], if you have some accents. Normally, *[they] select those with authentic British or American pronunciation, [because] they are considered the best ...* if a person comes from India, the chance is quite narrow for him to succeed. (T-5; Emphasis added)

The economic and cultural disparity as well as the prevalence of the pro-nativeness practices may lead to another type of “*irresistibility*” or “*inevitability*” among ELT stakeholders, which is represented as a psychological complex, i.e., “schizophrenia” (Jenkins, 2007). As A-6 put it,

If you trace human language back to its origin, [you will find] its main function is to facilitate communication. In other words, if you can understand different varieties of a language and conduct communications with them, you have attained the goal of communication, and then you don’t have to pursue an authentic, very genuine variety. What I mean is that in that way, everyone feels it is fair and reasonable. However, *I do wish that a comparatively authentic variety is needed as far as language itself is concerned. To date, I still feel it is marvelous to be able to speak American English very fluently.* (A-6; Emphasis added)

Observed from the expressions, “*I do wish*”, “*I still feel*” and the “*marvelous*” feeling “*to be able to speak American English very fluently*”, it is evident that A-6 subjugated himself to the StE ideology, despite his knowledge of the current pluralization of the English language and the equal communicative functionality of different English language varieties.

The two perspectives discussed in this section on the linguistic discrimination in relation to practice of prioritizing Inner Circle English in ELT can be said to contribute to reinforcing the dichotomy of Inner Circle English versus Outer and Expanding Circle English. On the one hand, most of the interviewees denied that to prioritize Inner Circle English or to uphold it as the learning/teaching reference or target entails discrimination or prejudice against other English language varieties. This makes the support of Inner Circle English appear to be a neutral choice. On the other hand, although some interviewees realized the discrimination, they deemed it irresistible or inevitable. The consequence of this mentality, in the words of Jenkins (2007), “schizophrenia”, may result in further passive acceptance of NS English on the part of many ELT stakeholders.

## **6.5 Discussion and summary**

This chapter provides answers to Research Question 2, which concerns the perceptions of the three groups of ELT stakeholders – students, teachers and administrators – on different English language varieties. It also answers part of Research Question 5, i.e., intergroup attitudinal (dis)similarities. Presented as follows is a summary of the major findings as well as the attendant discussions.

With regard to the relative status of different English language varieties, most of the participants maintained that Inner Circle English is superior to Outer and Expanding Circle English. Specifically, it was claimed to be (more) standard due to its conformity to NS grammar, (more) authentic owing to its origin and long-term historical trajectory in Inner Circle Countries, and (more) intelligible because it is unaccented or bears no particular local accents. Meanwhile, almost no significant difference in attitude and in reason was found between the students and the teachers whereas relevant statistics seems to show that administrators were most positive about Inner Circle English.

As for whose/which English to learn/teach, most of the participants were inclined to uphold Inner Circle English as the overall reference and NS English norms, particularly NS pronunciation, as the concrete target. The most obvious reason they maintained for this inclination was found aligned with the conventional belief in the superiority of Inner Circle English (see also Section 6.2). Other reasons stated by some teachers are

related to the predominant presence of ELT materials edited in Inner Circle English as well as their personal EFL learning experiences in which NS English was upheld as the norm. Although most of the administrators raised no requirements for their teachers and students to follow Inner Circle English out of the consideration of practical factors, i.e., the instrumental objective of CE education and their fellow teachers' inadequate competence in English, they regarded Inner Circle English and NS pronunciation as the ultimate learning and teaching target.

In terms of whether the prioritization or support of Inner Circle English in ELT entails discrimination or prejudice against Outer and Expanding Circle English, most of the participants supplied negative answers, contending that Inner Circle English is superb in (socio)linguistic terms and therefore entitled to be promoted as the learning/teaching reference and target. This is most evident among the student group. Personal freedom served as another perspective from which many administrators justified their negative answers. Although a small proportion of the teachers and administrators regarded the predominant promotion of Inner Circle English as a symptom of prejudice against other English language varieties, they asserted that it is irresistible or inevitable due to the historical-present hegemony of the English speaking West, the gate-keeping role of Inner Circle English and the pro-nativeness mentality among ELT stakeholders.

Observed from these findings, it is evident that the three participant groups as a whole held a pro-nativeness mentality. This mindset fosters the predominant support of Inner Circle English as being superior, which in turn serves as the rationale for their endorsing Inner Circle English and NS norms as the learning ideal in ELT. In the meantime, it can account for, in part, their denial of the related linguistic discrimination against Outer and Expanding Circle English. All of these findings corroborate those of many previous studies conducted in different ELT settings (e.g., Ahn, 2014; Yong & Walsh, 2010). In particular, they agree with the results of most studies focusing on the context of EFL education in China (e.g., Wang, 2015; Wei, 2016).

However, these three constructs, standard, authenticity and intelligibility, are far more complicated than what they seem to be. According to McKay & Bokhorst-Heng (2008), standard language is “a variety of a language that is considered the norm ... [and] regarded as the ideal for educational purposes, and usually used as a yardstick by which



to measure other varieties” (p. 138). As a rule, it is a variety used by a small group of social elites, but imposed upon the general masses as a prestigious norm to follow. In doing so, the dominant usually advocate the superiority of this variety while ascribing the status of dialect to that of the dominated (Wiley & Lukes, 1996, p. 514-515). This is also true of StE, which is in fact an English variety used by the dominant social class in Inner Circle countries but gains a superior status in global ELT due to the colonial expansion of British Empire and the rise of the United States after World War II.

The perception of English as being (more) authentic among the participants agrees with the conventional sociolinguistic construct of authenticity. In general, this construct is adopted to describe the linguistic output assumed to possess the natural language features of a community or of a person whose linguistic self is cultivated in that community (Eckert, 2003, p. 392). Following this line of thought, the construct of authenticity proposes an inseparable tie between language and location, such as nation, country or community (Lowe & Pinner, 2016, p. 32). Due to the globalization of the English language, there are many English language varieties rather than a monochrome one in the current world (e.g., Graddol, 1997, 2006; Rampton, 1990; Saraceni, 2009, 2010). If the tie between language, nation and country is inseparable, each English language variety conveys the culture of the particular setting where it operates and should therefore be considered authentic English. Observed further from the concept of fragmentation purported by the postmodernist scholarship (e.g., Featherstone, 1995), any language is not a monolithic and stable unity; it is always in the process of mixing with other language codes (e.g., Canagarajah, 2014). In this logic, the authenticity of a language should be viewed in accordance with “the context of situation which is appropriate to the variety, its uses and users” (Kachru, 1983, p. 215).

The general perception of Inner Circle English as being (more) intelligible among the three groups of participants goes against the real meaning of intelligibility. According to Smith (1992, p. 76), the intelligibility of a language depends on the collaboration of three layers of factors: intelligibility (word/utterance recognition), comprehensibility (recognition of the semantic meaning of word/utterance) and interpretability (recognition of the pragmatic or social meaning behind word/utterance). In other words, “What is called ‘intelligibility’ is perhaps a complex of factors comprising recognizing an expression, knowing its meaning, and knowing what that meaning signifies in the

sociocultural context” (Bamgbose, 1998, p. 11). In this logic, phonological elements alone cannot guarantee comprehension. At the same time, the interpretability of linguistic codes relies on the degree to which a person is familiar with those codes. As such, “the greater the familiarity a speaker (native or non-native) has with a variety of English [and the culture in which it is embedded], the more likely it is that s/he will understand ... members of that speech community” (Smith, 1992, p. 76). In this sense, “it is people, not language codes, that understand one another” (Bamgbose, 1998, p. 11). In addition, the pervasive claim made by most of the participants that Inner Circle English bears no accent runs counter to the fact that “everyone speaks a language with a particular accent” (Rajadurai, 2007, p. 91).

Following these arguments, it can be concluded that the notion of Inner Circle English as being (more) standard, authentic and intelligible is linguistically unscientific and conceptually outdated. It is in fact a socially constructed linguistic myth entangled with the dynamics of discourse, ideology and power (e.g., Davila, 2016; Trudgill & Hannah, 2013). Considering that “linguistic ideologies are not autonomous but interacted with other social ideologies” (Wiley & Lukes 1996, p. 516), sociocultural and historical-political sources should be resorted to in order to explain why most of the participants in this study succumbed to these constructs and the Native-speakerist mentality thereof.

Firstly, the pro-nativeness tradition of ELT in China and beyond provides the conditions for Native-speakerism to gain its legitimacy among these participants because people tend to follow the practice of most others (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999, p. 105). As stated previously (see Section, 1.4), EFL education in China has been granting a superior status to Inner Circle English. For instance, Anglo-American English is usually adopted as the default teaching reference and learning target in classroom instruction (e.g., Fong, 2009; Wen, 2012b). Other ELT practices, such as editing textbooks or designing English proficiency tests, also adhere to or are oriented toward Inner Circle English norms. In addition, much research that focuses on China’s EFL education is intended to seek the most effective teaching and learning strategies for acquiring StE (see Fang, 2016). The prioritization of Inner Circle English in these sectors has constructed a dominant pro-nativeness discourse, which, in tandem with the Native-speakerist tradition in global ELT, is most likely to create a strong pro-nativeness mentality among Chinese ELT stakeholders, as is revealed in this study.

Secondly, the strong support of Inner Circle English by most of the participants could be ascribed to the institutional and expert discourses. By institutional discourse, it refers mainly to ELT policies or regulations issued by the Chinese MOE whereas expert discourse refers to the scholarship of relevant research communities. As stated earlier (see Section 1.4), NS English has been constructed discursively as the norm to follow in China's national EFL curriculum syllabi or requirements, particularly during the past few years. For instance, *College English Course Requirement* (2007) provides that the advanced English learners are expected "to be able to understand the TV programs of English speaking countries, grasp the main idea and catch the gist, and to be able to understand personnel from English speaking countries when they speak at norm speed" (MOE, 2007, p. 7, my translation). Although there is no exact delimitation regarding "English speaking countries", they are actually referred to as Inner Circle countries if the ideological support of Anglo-American English by the central government of China is taken into consideration (see Fong, 2009). Examples of expert discourse in favor of Inner Circle English exist in a large quantity, as is evidenced by the scholarly works appertaining to ELT, such as SLA scholarship, which tend to advocate the attainment of NS linguacultural competence as the ultimate goal (e.g., Cook, 1999; Mahboob, 2005). As stated earlier (see Section 5.6), the centralized political system has resulted in the strict adherence of school education in China to the policies issued by Chinese MOE. Moreover, the traditional Chinese culture that values authority makes individuals vulnerable in mind and in action to those holding a higher social status including experts. As such, the pro-nativeness rhetoric of ELT policy makers and renowned applied linguistic and ELT scholars achieves an authoritative and legitimate status. This allows them to further "determines the contents and the organizations of public knowledge [and] the hierarchies of beliefs (van Dijk, 2008, p. 36) in ELT, governing in particular the mind of those engaged in everyday ELT practice by "providing them with a frame for action, without which they could not act" (Fairclough, 1995: 38). This is why the institutional and expert discourses should be referred to in anatomizing and disinventing the pro-nativeness mentality of Chinese ELT stakeholders.

Thirdly, the EFL context of China contributes to reproducing the pro-nativeness attitude among the participants. In accordance with the Kachruvian paradigm (Kachru, 1985), China is categorized as a norm-dependent Expanding Circle country, where English

serves as a foreign language and learning English takes place mainly in the classroom. In this case, English learners and even teachers have insufficient chances to use English outside the classroom, with the indigenization of the English language in China severely hindered, though China English is emerging. In the meantime, they have few chances to be exposed to other English language varieties in classroom (e.g., Fang, 2016), as the adherence to NS norms is considered normative in EFL education (e.g., Holliday, 2005; Jenkins, 2012). Since ideology is socialized through discourse (e.g., van Dijk, 1998), the insufficient contact with other English language varieties is not helpful for fostering texts or talks that challenge or counter NS norms. As a corollary, the traditional Native-speakerist EFL education paradigm remains intact. It is thereby not surprising that most of the participants in this study expressed a strong preference for Inner Circle English.

Lastly, the promotion of *Putonghua*, i.e., Standard Mandarin Chinese, by the Chinese government since 1956 has facilitated the internalization of the Standard Language ideology in China. One Chinese language variety has been accepted as a grammatically and phonologically correct Chinese language, modern and civilized, whereas the others are given a derogatory name, “local dialect(s) or vernacular (s)”. This may explain in part why many participants (e.g., A-8, TI-2) often resorted to the hierarchical relationship of different Chinese language varieties to justify the sociolinguistic superiority of Inner Circle English vis-à-vis other English language varieties. While recontextualizing the standard Chinese ideology to justify the superiority of Inner Circle English, they failed to realize that *Putonghua* is in fact a political construct. In particular, they were not aware that the differentiation of language varieties in reference to the standard language versus dialect dichotomy (re)produces unequal power relations among the varieties and their users (Calvet, 1974, as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p. 39).

In addition to the strong support of Inner Circle English among the three participant groups, this study displays some interesting findings. As is presented in Sections 6.2, a certain percent of the students and teachers chose the “Not sure” answers to the Likert scale statements in praise of the sociolinguistic merits of Inner Circle English. This may reflect the ideological effects on those students and teachers executed by the academic discourse on the glocalization of English (e.g., Jenkins, 2007; Kachru, 2005). The selection of the “Not sure” answer by an unneglectable percent of the students and

teachers to the question items on whether to follow NS standard in ELT (see Section 6.3) may have to do more with their reflections on the appropriateness of following NS norms in ELT. That more teachers in percentage selected the “Not sure” answer may reside in teachers’ comparative easiness in accessing these critical voices and/or their deeper reflections on the practicality of following the NS standard in ELT. Arguably, these choices are also related to the common tendency that participants tend to choose the middle point of Likert scale questions with an odd number of options (Chan 2017; Stening & Everett, 1984). In light of the complexity of interpretations, further studies on this issue are warranted.

It was also stated that a certain percent of the students and teachers expressed the desire to take China English as the learning/teaching target (see Section 6.3.1), despite the strong support of Inner Circle English as being superior. This finding can be viewed as another piece of evidence of the effects of academic discourse, particularly the expert discourse on China English (e.g., Ge, 1980; Hu, 2004; Xu, 2010). Arguably, that more teachers in percentage than students made this choice is also related to their easier accessibility to latest academic works. In contrast to the support of China English, the vast majority of the students and teachers expressed preferences for NS pronunciation, though tolerating the influence of Chinese accent to a certain extent. It seems that for those students and teachers, China English only exists at the lexical or even syntactical level. However, it remains a question how far away China English is different from Inner Circle English in lexicon and syntax that is still acceptable to those students and teachers (see Yang & Zhang, 2015). In this same vein, it is worthwhile to explore the acceptance range of those students and teachers regarding the phonological deviation of China English from Inner Circle English.

In addition, the administrators seemed to grant more merits to Inner Circle English than the students and teachers (see Section 6.2.1). The opposite finding had been expected because they normally have easier accessibility to the latest expert discourse than the students and teachers. Given the small number of the administrators in this study, this finding needs to be validated by future studies that incorporate more administrators as participants.

Despite these interesting findings, the vast majority of the participants were found

granting a superior status to Inner Circle English, expressing the desire to follow NS norm in learning/teaching English, and denying the attendant linguistic discrimination against Outer and Expanding Circle English. As such, it can be concluded that Native-speakerism is still kicking in the arena of China's EFL education. Albeit that, some interesting findings were revealed. Given that language learning always accompanies cultural learning, whether Inner Circle culture is upheld as the learning/teaching reference and target by ELT stakeholders constitutes another focus of this study. Findings in relation to this issue are presented and discussed in the following chapter.

## **Chapter 7 Viewpoints on Cultural Orientations of ELT**

### **7.1 Introduction**

The glocalization of the English language has given birth to many English varieties, changing its cultural base and posing challenges to its ownership that have been granted to Inner Circle countries. However, the three groups of participants – students, teachers and administrators – as a whole were found buying into Native-speakerism in support of Inner Circle English (see Chapter 6). In order to find out whether – if so, to what extent – the conventional pro-nativeness ideology to do with the cultural orientation of ELT still prevails in China’s EFL education, this chapter analyzes the responses of the three participant groups to the related question items utilized in the questionnaire surveys and interviews. In doing so, it answers Research Question 3, i.e., the viewpoints of the three stakeholder groups on the cultural orientations of ELT, and part of Research Question 5, i.e., the intergroup attitudinal (dis)similarities (see Section 1.3).

The whole chapter is organized into five sections. Following the introduction (Section 7.1), Section 7.2 analyzes the viewpoints of the three participant groups on the relations between Inner Circle culture and English language learning, with a focus on their opinions about the cultural bedrock of the English language and the cultural reference in learning English. Section 7.3 explores whether the participants themselves expect to learn/teach Inner Circle culture. In doing so, it analyzes the participants’ preferences regarding four types of EFL textbooks, the content of which is embedded in different cultures. Section 7.4 probes into their perceptions of whether the promotion of Inner Circle culture in China’s EFL education entails a threat to or an oppression over the development of traditional Chinese culture. In dissecting data surrounding these issues, intergroup (dis)similarities in viewpoint were also explored. This chapter concludes with a discussion and summary of the major findings presented in these sections.

### **7.2 Attitudes toward Inner Circle culture in English language learning**

This section explores the viewpoints of the participants on the relations between Inner Circle culture and English language learning. Data were collected through Likert scale

items (for students, Items 13-16 and Items 7 and 8; for teachers, Items 24, 15 and 25) and the questions utilized in interviews (Item 7 for students; Items 5 and 6 for teachers; Item 10 for administrators).

### 7.2.1 Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language

The analysis of the quantitative data indicates that most of the students regarded Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language. This is evident from the statistics reported in Table 7.1, which summarizes the responses of the student group to the four aforementioned Likert scale questions.

Table 7.1 Students' viewpoints on the cultural bedrock of the English language

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 13. The English language is based on the culture of traditional native English speaking countries (e.g., Britain and America).	4.3%	9.8%	25.5%	41.4%	18.8%	3.61	1.034
Item 14. Some countries (e.g., India) take English as the second language, but their cultures are not the base of English.	5.1%	12.0%	33.3%	36.2%	13.3%	3.41	1.028
Item 15. Some countries (e.g., China) take English as a foreign language, but their cultures cannot become its real cultural ingredients.	7.3%	20.0%	33.2%	26.9%	12.6%	3.18	1.113
Item 16. The English language conveys the culture of traditional native English speaking countries, though the cultures of other countries have currently entered it on a large scale.	6.5%	15.9%	29.4%	34.5%	13.7%	3.33	1.097
Total	1.7%	7.8%	39.0%	40.9%	10.5%	3.48	0.802

Notes: N = 817; SD = standard deviation

According to the statistical information in this table, the mean for this question cluster reaches ( $3.48 \pm 0.802$ ), a proof of the overall pro-nativeness attitude. It is also proved by the average total percentage (51.4%) for the students in (strong) agreement on Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language, in contrast to 9.5% who expressed opposite opinions. This pro-nativeness propensity is most visible from the responses to



Item 13, which collected support from 60.2% of the students. However, it seemed to decrease when Outer and Expanding Circle cultures are mentioned, as can be seen from the statistics that describes the attitudes of the students toward the other three statements, particularly Item 15. It is noted that an average of 39.0% of the students selected the “Not sure” answer.

Based on the statistics collected from teacher participants through Item 24 (Table 7.2), a strong pro-nativeness attitude was also found among them. This is evident from the mean ( $3.60 \pm 0.917$ ) as well as the percentage (54.6%) for the teachers who expressed (strong) agreement on this Likert scale statement. Notably, no one expressed strong disagreement but about one third of the teachers (33.8%) chose the “Not sure” answer.

Table 7.2 Teachers’ viewpoints on the cultural bedrock of the English language

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 24. The culture of native English speaking countries is the pillar of the English language.	0.0%	11.8%	33.8%	36.8%	17.8%	3.60	0.917

Notes: N = 68; SD = standard deviation

Despite the intergroup similarity in pro-nativeness attitudinal tendency, the difference in average mean between the students ( $3.48 \pm 0.802$ ) and the teachers ( $3.60 \pm 0.917$ ) seems to indicate a discrepancy in degree to which the two groups identified with Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language. However, the results of the Independent Samples t-test (see Table 7.3) suggest that the numerical disparity is of no statistical significance ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $d = 0.13$ ).

Table 7.3 Independent Samples t-test of the viewpoints of students and teachers on the cultural bedrock of the English language

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.48	0.802	3.60	0.917	1.947	75.792	0.06	0.22	0.13

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen’s d

Data collected from the students and teachers through interviews also indicate that a

pro-nativeness attitude prevailed within these two participant groups. Precisely, 88.5% (23) of the 26 student interviewees expressed agreement on the popular discourse in ELT that one has to learn Inner Circle culture in order to acquire English (Question Item 7). This is evident from the discursive strategies and related linguistic realizations in the talks and/or texts they produced regarding this issue.

Indicated by the data, those students seemed to regard it as a given fact that Inner Circle culture serves as the pillar of the English language, as is represented by the unmodified predicates as well as the matter-of-fact statements, such as those initiated by “*It is well known*” and “*It is natural*” (SI-12). In justifying this stance, they frequently utilized metaphorical words that convey a sense of historical validity, such as “origin”, “source” or “root”, as many student interviewees did in defending their belief in the authenticity of Inner Circle English (see Section 6.2.2). In addition to the perspective of genealogy, they attempted to seek proof from the traditional well-established anthropological episteme on the inseparability between language and culture (e.g., Brown, 1994, p. 165). As SI-12 put it,

*It is well known* that English originated from Britain and further developed in other native English speaking countries. Since language cannot be separated from culture, they are a unity, [and] *it is natural* that English is rooted in the culture of those countries. (SI-12; Emphasis added)

Similar discursive strategies and related linguistic forms are apparent in the responses provided by 71.4% (10) of the 14 teacher interviewees to Question Item 5 (*What do you think about the relations between the culture of native English speaking countries and the English language?*). In the exemplifying excerpt present below, the episteme on the language-culture inseparability is also adopted as a given fact, from which TI-8 started to elaborate on her support of Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of English.

*Since language is entwined with culture*, of course, English is deeply *rooted* in native English speaking countries, particularly Britain or America. English *originated* from these countries ... it represents their social, political, economic culture [and] the everyday life of people living in these countries. Therefore, *these countries are the soil where English grows and develops*. (TI-8; Emphasis added).

For the administrators, no question is targeted directly at soliciting their viewpoints on whether Inner Circle culture constitutes the cultural bedrock of the English language.

However, their views on this issue can be observed from the responses they made to Question Item 10 (*What do you think about the practice that lays strong emphasis on teaching/learning the culture of the English speaking West in China's EFL education?*).

When answering this question, 75% (6) of the administrators asserted that Inner Circle culture deserves the emphasis because it is the cultural pillar of genuine or pure English. Compared in percentage with the overall attitudinal tendency of the students and teachers discovered through the questionnaire surveys (see Tables 7.1 and 7.2), the administrator group seemed more inclined to accept the construct that Inner Circle culture is the bedrock of the English language. Similar to the linguistic forms in the comments made by many students and teachers, words and expressions signifying historical validity permeate the remarks of these administrators. As A-7 put it,

The emphasis on learning the culture of native English speaking countries embodies [the pursuit of] the *purity* of English. Of course, to learn English, one has to learn the *authentic English* and understand the *authentic culture* ... English is *rooted* in the cultural soil of those countries (A-7; emphasis added)

Observed from the excerpts quoted above, the overarching logic followed by the stakeholders in defending their pro-nativeness stance is transparent. To summarize, the English language derives from Inner Circle countries, which have their idiosyncratic culture; the inseparability between language and culture makes Inner Circle culture the natural bedrock of the English language. In this sense, this macro logic resonates with the traditional essentialist construct on the nation-language-culture trinity (e.g., Anderson, 2006), denying conversly the cultures of other countries as the cultural base of the English language. As such, this finding, in tandem with the statistical discoveries, reinforces to a great degree the traditional polarization of NS and NNS cultures in relation to the English language (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2008; McKay, 2012a).

### 7.2.2 Inner Circle culture as the reference in learning English

The conventional endorsement for Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language leads to a predominant rhetoric in support of Inner Circle culture as the point of reference in learning English (e.g., Dewey, 2015; McKay, 2012b). This section explores whether the three stakeholder groups identify with this rhetoric as well as the

reasons they stated.

In the questionnaire for students, Items 7-8 were intended to investigate the viewpoints of the students on this rhetoric. According to the statistics reported in the Table 7.4, an overall pro-nativeness stance was found prevailing within the student group. This is evident in the average mean ( $3.58 \pm 0.970$ ) for this question cluster as well as the average total percentage (66.4%) for the students in (strong) agreement on the statement that one should learn English the way NSs use this language, both orally and in written form. In other words, they were convinced that one should take the sociolinguistic or pragmatic norms of NSs as the point of reference in learning English. For these students, it seems that learners of English would only contact NSs from Inner Circle countries in the future. Notably, only 9.3% of the students expressed oppositions, but about one-fourth (24.3%) of the students selected the “Not sure” answer.

Table 7.4 Students’ viewpoints about taking NS cultural norms as the point of reference in learning English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 7. To learn English well, learners need to imitate the oral expressions of NSs.	4.9%	9.9%	25.3%	38.1%	21.8%	3.62	1.076
Item 8. To learn English well, learners need to imitate the writing convention of NSs.	5.3%	10.9%	28.6%	35.0%	20.2%	3.54	1.089
Total	2.8%	6.5%	24.3%	44.5%	21.9%	3.58	0.970

Notes: N = 817; NSs = native speakers; SD = standard deviation

The viewpoints of the teacher participants on this rhetoric are also observable from their responses to two Likert scale questions (Items 15 and 25). Table 7.5 summarizes in statistics the data collected.

As with the student group, the statistical data suggests a strong pro-nativeness stance among the teachers. This is represented by the average mean ( $3.62 \pm 0.916$ ) for these two Likert scale questions as well as the average total percentage (63.3%) for the teachers who expressed (strong) agreement on getting rid of L1 culture transfer and adhering to NS cultural norms in learning English. By contrast, only 7.4% of the teachers expressed oppositions. Interestingly, 29.3% of the teachers displayed a “Not sure” stance.

Table 7.5 Teachers' viewpoints about taking NS cultural norms as the point of reference in learning English

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 15. English language learners must work hard to get rid of the interference of their mother tongue culture.	2.9%	13.3%	19.1%	36.8%	27.9%	3.74	1.01
Item 25. English language learners must follow NS cultural norms in using English.	1.5%	14.7%	35.3%	27.9%	20.6%	3.51	1.029
Total	1.5%	5.9%	29.3%	38.3%	25%	3.62	0.916

Notes: N = 68; NS = native speaker; SD = standard deviation

Observed from Tables 7.4 and 7.5, a similar pro-nativeness attitudinal tendency seemed to exist among the students and teachers. This is confirmed by the results of the Independent Samples t-test (Table 7.6), which suggest that the statistical difference in mean between these two groups bears no statistical significance ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $d = 0.02$ ).

Table 7.6 Independent Samples t-test of the viewpoints of the students and the teachers about adopting NS cultural norms as the point of reference in learning English

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.58	0.970	3.62	0.916	-0.358	883	0.721	0.04	0.02

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen's d

The statistics presented above in this subsection is indicative of a strong pro-nativeness mentality among the students and teachers. It is more evident from the responses made by the students during interviews to Question Item 7 (students) and the teachers to Item 6, which is the same as Item 10 for the administrators (see Section 7.2.1). The 26 student interviewees and the 14 teachers all considered it normative to lay emphasis on teaching/learning Inner Circle culture in ELT.

When justifying this viewpoint, most of the students seemed to develop their arguments in line with the principle of rationality and altruism (see van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). On the one hand, they resorted to the well-established anthropological episteme, namely,

language is inseparable from culture (e.g., Kramsch, 1998), as they did in arguing for their support of Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of English (see Section 7.2.1). On the other hand, they claimed that a good knowledge of Inner Circle culture is beneficial for students to learn English. In other words, to learn Inner Circle culture is a rational act because English is rooted in Inner Circle culture; to take it as the reference can bring benefits to students because it can deepen their understandings of the English language. Following this line of thoughts, it seems necessary to take Inner Circle culture as the reference. In addition, those students presented their arguments in a state-of-the-fact manner, which is represented in the modal word, “must”, and the auxiliary word, “will”, that predicts the undesirable learning results. As SI-26 put it,

To learn a language, you *must* learn its culture. *Otherwise*, your knowledge of the language will be like the *water without a source or a tree without a root*, and you will not be able to understand the connotation of the language. *You will only know the how without knowing the why*. This is a great pity for language learners. (SI-26; Emphasis added)

Most teacher interviewees also justifies the necessity for taking Inner Circle culture as the reference point from these two perspectives. In addition to acquiring the English language, 50% (7) of the 14 teachers claimed that a good knowledge of the Inner Circle culture is conducive for English learners to develop intercultural competence and minimize the chances of “*cultural shocks*” (TI-7) and communicative breakdowns. It seems that those teachers denied the role of L1 culture in facilitating intercultural communications (see Savignon, & Wang, 2003). In the words of TI-2,

Language is a special social and cultural phenomenon. It becomes conventionalized through people’s long-term social practices ... Each language is produced and developed in a particular social and historical context ... each language reflects the cultural phenomenon that is unique to the countries or nations that use the language in specific social environments and historical phases. *The lack of background knowledge and cultural awareness will easily lead to breakdowns in language communication*. (TI-2; Emphasis added)

This pro-nativeness mentality was also found prevalent among the eight administrators, as is evidenced by their responses to Question Item 10. To be specific, 75% (6) of the administrators deemed it normative to take Inner Circle culture as the reference in learning English. Compared this percentage with those representing the students and teachers in support of Inner Circle culture during the questionnaire surveys (see Tables

7.4 and 7.5), it seems that administrators as a whole possessed a stronger pro-nativeness attitude. In justifying this standpoint, they developed their argument from the same perspectives – rationality and altruism – as most of the students and teachers did during interviews. As A-2 put it,

In terms of English language learners, it is indeed necessary for them to learn the culture of English speaking countries, as *language and culture are inseparable. Only equipped with the knowledge about its culture can one acquire the English language.* (A-2; emphasis added)

Observed from this excerpt as well as the others in this subsection, the three groups of interviewees as a whole agreed on taking Inner Circle culture as the point of reference in learning English. This attitudinal tendency, in tandem with the statistical findings resonates, to a great degree, with the traditional monocultural tenet in ELT, namely, learners need to acculturate to L2 culture or follow L2 linguacultural norms (e.g., Baker, 2011; Byram, 1988; Schumann, 1986). Moreover, this pro-nativeness stance, alongside the prevalent support of Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of English (Section 7.2.1) seem to prove that most of the participant did not realize or refuse to accept the current globalization of the English language, resulting in the reinforcement of the hegemony of Inner Circle culture in ELT (e.g., Phillipson, 1992, 2009).

### **7.3 Whose/which culture to learn/teach**

The preceding section indicates that the three stakeholder bodies as a whole agreed on Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of English and the point of reference in ELT. In order to find out whether the participants themselves expect to learn/teach Inner Circle culture, this section analyzes their viewpoints on four categories of EFL textbooks, whose content is embedded in different cultures, as textbooks serve as the primary channel through which English is acquired in Expanding Circle countries, particularly in China.

#### **7.3.1 The learning/teaching target**

The viewpoints of the students and teachers on learning/teaching target can be observed from their responses to two semi-open questions (Item 23 for students; Item 28 for

teachers) utilized in the questionnaire surveys.

The two question items are similar in content. Each provides a scenario where four types of EFL textbooks are available for choice. The content of the textbooks resides in different cultures. Textbook A is embedded merely in Inner Circle culture, particularly Anglo-American culture; Textbook B concentrates on Inner Circle culture, particularly Anglo-American culture, but includes a small quantity of Outer Circle culture; Textbook C is similar to Textbook B in respect of Inner Circle culture, but contains a small amount of Chinese cultural information. In Textbook D, the cultural information of Inner Circle countries, Outer Circle countries and China is almost equal in proportion.

Table 7.7 presents the statistics concerning the textbook preference of the student group. Suggested by the statistical information, the majority of the students expressed support to textbooks whose content resides mainly in Inner Circle culture, with a small quantity of cultural information of other countries as a supplement. This is evidenced by 31.0% (253) and 27.6% (224) of the students who selected Textbooks B and C respectively. Although Textbook D is highly multicultural in content, it was selected only by 26.1% of the students. Interestingly, Textbook A collected the least support.

Table 7.7 Students' viewpoints about the ideal English language textbook

Item 23. Of Textbooks A/B/C/D, which one would you recommend first to your teacher?	A	B	C	D	Total
Students (N=817)	15.5% (127)	31.0% (253)	27.4% (224)	26.1% (213)	100%

The viewpoints of the teacher group about this issue can be observed from the statistics in Table 7.8. As with most of the students, teachers of a high percentage regarded Inner Circle culture as the major learning target. To be specific, 47% (32) of the 68 teachers expressed preferences for Textbooks B and C. Despite the similarity, Textbook B received less support from the teachers. Meanwhile, 36.8% (25) of the teachers selected Textbook D, which is about 10% higher than the students who made the same choice. Suggested by these numerical figures, it seems that the teacher group had a stronger multicultural awareness.



Table 7.8 Teachers' viewpoints about the ideal English language textbook

Item 28. Of Textbooks A/B/C/D, which one would be your first choice?	A	B	C	D	Total
Teachers (N=68)	16.2% (11)	19.1% (13)	27.9% (19)	36.8% (25)	100%

The viewpoints of the eight administrators on learning/teaching cultures can be seen from their responses to Question Item 11 (*In terms of English language teaching itself, which country's culture do you expect most to be represented in English language textbooks?*). During the interviews, all of them stated that EFL textbooks should be embedded in Inner Circle culture, but need to include a small quantity of the cultural information of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries, particularly that of China. As A-8 put it,

[English language textbooks] *should* represent mainly the culture of Inner Circle countries, particularly the culture of Britain and America. Currently, *I think* it is proper for them to carry some Chinese culture. *I think* it is fine to express Chinese culture in English. After all, they are textbooks of English. *I think* they should represent more culture related to the English language. About this proportion, *I feel* Inner Circle culture should take up a larger proportion. (A-8; Emphasis added)

In this excerpt, A-8 articulated her pro-nativeness preference repeatedly. This rhetorical pattern can be said to compensate for his seemingly tentative stance as conveyed in those modified expressions, such as "*I think*". Compared with A-8, other administrators expressed this stance more affirmatively. For instance,

In my opinion, [*English language textbooks*] *should represent the culture of the Commonwealth Nations or that of America* ... They can incorporate some Chinese culture, but *it is inappropriate to integrate much Chinese cultural information into the textbooks*. (A-7; Emphasis added)

In terms of percentage, the administrator group seemed to be more supportive of learning/teaching Inner Circle culture than the students and teachers participating in the questionnaire surveys, though an exact statistical comparison cannot be conducted due to the intergroup difference in data type and sample size.

The findings presented in this subsection indicate a complicated mentality in relation to learning/teaching cultures of specific countries among most of the participants. On

the one hand, they upheld Inner Circle culture as the major learning target. On the other hand, they expected textbooks to incorporate certain amounts of culture of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries as a supplement to Inner Circle culture. Albeit that, the acquisition of Inner Circle culture is still taken as the major objective if all the statistical information presented in this subsection are viewed as a whole.

### 7.3.2 Justifications for target selection

In addition to indicating their favorite textbooks in answering two semi-open multi-choice questions, the students and teachers were asked to state reasons for their choices. For the administrators, the rationales for their preferences can be abstracted from their answers to Question Item 11. This section analyzes the major reasons they stated, with a focus on the discursive strategies, particularly argumentation and perspectivization, and the related linguistic forms they adopted to justify their stances.

As regards the expectation for incorporating a small amount of cultural elements of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries, particularly Chinese culture, most of the stakeholders resorted to the logic or perspective of educational effects, asserting that it is beneficial for students to acquire different cultures and the English language. In this sense, the choice seems to abide by the principle of altruism. Precisely, this argument reverberates in the reasons provided by 46.6% (118) of the 253 students who selected Textbook B and 65.9% (147) of the 223 in favor of Textbook C (see Table 7.7). For instance, 43.2% (51) of the 118 students in support of Textbook B stated that such textbooks are “*rich in content*” (e.g., S-39, S-493 or S-564) and helpful for students to “*learn the cultures of different countries*” (e.g., S-81, S-223 or S-733). 54.4% (80) of the 147 students in favor of Textbook C asserted that the inclusion of Chinese culture, though small in quantity, can help students to “*perceive the difference between Sino-foreign cultures*” (S-196), “*improve their interests or motivations*” (e.g., S-56, S-203 or S-811) and “*reduce learning difficulties*” (e.g., S-34, S-156 or S-343) in learning English. Similar arguments are observable in the reasons provided by most of the students who selected Textbook D.

Most of the teacher participants also adopted the logic of educational effects to justify their expectations for including the culture of traditionally nonnative English speaking

countries. Of the 11 teachers who provided reasons for supporting Textbook B, 36.4% (4) stated that such textbooks are helpful for students to “*learn different cultures*” (T-49) and another 36.4% (4) asserted it is beneficial for students to “*understand Anglo-American culture*” (T-37). This logic is also represented in the justifications presented by those in favor of Textbook D. Of the 22 teachers who provided reasons, 68.2% (15) stated that students can learn cultures of different countries (e.g., T-12, T-44 or T-65) and 31.8% (7) also considered such textbooks motivating (e.g., T-39, T-40 or T-54).

A similar logic is evident in the reasons supplied by four administrators (A-1, A-3, A-4 and A-7). They asserted that the inclusion of a small amount of Chinese culture is beneficial for students to attain a better understanding of Inner Circle culture and the English language, as Chinese culture can serve as a point of comparison. Moreover, they argued for the side effects of monocultural textbooks on students’ understanding of the target culture. In the words of A-1,

Chinese culture is indispensable in learning English. If just focusing on Anglo-American culture without learning Chinese culture, students will only get a superficial understanding of the former culture and cannot reflect on it deeply ... *Through comparing the two cultures, students can have a better understanding of the culture behind the English language.* (A-1; Emphasis added)

In addition to the logic of educational effects, the logic of nationalism is evident among the reasons provided by the participants in support of learning Chinese culture in EFL education. For instance, 15.6% (23) of the 147 students who provided reasons for supporting Textbook C stated that one of the objectives of learning English is “*to learn foreign culture and to transmit Chinese culture*” (S-160). Compared with the low percentage for the students, the proportion of the teachers holding this viewpoint is much higher. To be specific, 82.4% (16) of the 19 teachers who selected Textbook C provided reasons. Of them, 56.3% (9) maintained that the incorporation of Chinese culture is beneficial for students to “*lose no chance to learn the culture of their own country*” (T-36). Many teachers also stated this logic in justifying their selection of Textbook D. For them, textbooks that include Chinese culture is conducive for students to develop the capability to “*express Chinese culture in English*” (T-5).

Compared with the students and teachers, the administrators seemed to express a more explicit nationalist stance. To be specific, five administrators (A-1, A-2, A-5, A-6 and

A-8) articulated the necessity for students to learn Chinese culture so that they can transmit it to the outside world. This standpoint seems to reflect the strong nationalism constructed in China due to the currently escalating status of China in global politics, economy and technology. As A-5 put it,

In the past, particularly when the Open and Reform policy was initiated, English textbooks for non-English-major students represented Anglo-American culture, because Britain and America are advanced in technology. Learning English at that time was for learning advanced technology and advanced culture ... *Currently, China has become more and more developed* ... and should shoulder more responsibilities for the world ... Therefore, [Chinese] students should *know more about the world* ... and *let the world know more about Chinese culture*. (A-5; Emphasis added)

Despite the expectation for incorporating cultures of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries into EFL textbooks, no one was found to defend his/her stance explicitly by turning to the globalization of the English language. Notably, only a small amount of such cultures was expected. These findings indicate that Inner Circle culture was viewed as the core learning and teaching target on the part of the three participant groups. Regarding this attitudinal tendency, both the students and the teachers did not present explicit reasons. By contrast, the administrators resorted explicitly to the traditional anthropological episteme about the inseparability of language and culture for explanation. In their view, English only belongs to Inner Circle countries and that learners of English should abide by NS norms in using English (see Marlina, 2014; McKay, 2012a). Usually, they expressed this stance affirmatively. The explicitness and affirmativeness are evident in the exemplifying excerpt presented below, particularly in this line, “... to learn their language, *you have to learn their culture*”.

*I feel the reason for [concentrating on Inner Circle culture] lies in the inseparability of language and culture. Suppose you only know [the linguistic aspect of] the English language and have no knowledge about its culture, you will not know whether you should say “Have you eaten?” or “Where are you going?” when you meet a person [from Inner Circle countries]. These greetings are acceptable in China, but are impossible for Westerners to accept because they are inappropriate in Western culture. So ... to learn their language, you have to learn their culture.* (A-7; Emphasis added)

All of these findings stated in this section are indicative of the strong stance in support of the conventional monocultural tenet, though it stays under the guise of a seemingly liberal perspective on ELT. In this sense, they are corroborative of the discoveries reported in Section 7.2, namely, most participants upheld Inner Circle as the bedrock

of the English language and the overarching reference in learning English. Given these pro-nativeness findings as well as the constant promotion of multiculturalism in the current era, a question arises, namely, whether the stakeholders realize that the strong endorsement for or emphasis on Inner Circle culture in China's EFL education entails a threat to the development of traditional Chinese culture.

#### **7.4 Perceptions of cultural threat**

The perceptions of the three stakeholder groups on the culture discrimination issue can be seen from the data collected through three relevant questions utilized in interviews (Item 8 for students; Item 7 for teachers; Item 12 for administrators). Based on the data collected, this section analyzes the viewpoints of the stakeholders with a focus on how they justified their stances.

Most of the interviewees were found denying that emphasizing learning/teaching Inner Circle culture in China's ELT entails a threat to or a source to generate an oppression over the development of Chinese culture. Precisely, 92.3% (24) of the 26 students and 75% (6) of the eight administrators expressed disagreement on this viewpoint. Of the 14 teacher interviewees, 42.9% (6) displayed the same standpoint whereas 57.1% (8) provided affirmative answers. Further analysis of the data reveals intra- and inter-group variations regarding the reasons articulated by those stakeholders.

Of the 24 students who denied the threat to Chinese culture, 16 (66.7%) resorted to the perspective or logic of instrumentalism to justify this position. They claimed that to learn Inner Circle culture, particularly Anglo-American culture would help learners to absorb its nutrients, which can facilitate the development of traditional Chinese culture rather than constituting a threat to it. Underneath this perspective rings the traditional colonial rhetoric that Inner Circle culture is superb and developing countries need to learn Inner Circle culture for the sake of their development. In this logic, learning Inner Circle culture can be regarded as a patriotic practice in respect nation construction (e.g., Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). As SI-3 put it,

*I don't agree with the idea that laying emphasis on Western culture <sup>[14]</sup> in English language education entails discriminations against the culture of our country... While learning Western culture, we can absorb its quintessence for our use in order to develop Chinese culture, and to inject fresh blood for the development of our own culture.* (SI-3; Emphasis added)

While emphasizing the benefits of learning Inner Circle culture, SI-3 denied explicitly the contributions of Chinese culture to the development of Inner Circle culture. This standpoint is also evident in remarks of other students. For example, SI-8 stated, though he did not acknowledge the overemphasis on Inner Circle culture in EFL education in China,

Personally, *I don't think* that there is a phenomenon of overemphasizing Western culture in the field of English language education in our country. Even if there is more emphasis on learning Western culture, there is nothing negative about it. After all, *we need to learn more culture that is Western*. However, this is not a discrimination against or an oppression over the culture of our country. *In this globalized world, it is imperative for us to be open to the outside world and learn from the world.* (SI-8; Emphasis added)

As with SI-3, SI-8 deemed it necessary to learn Inner Circle culture. This is especially apparent in his claim that “*we need to learn more culture that is Western*”. When declaring the necessity “*to be open to the outside world and learn from the world*” in the current globalized world, she seemed to equate the outside world with Inner Circle countries, granting a global status to Inner Circle culture.

In addition to the instrumentalist mentality and its related sociopolitical motivation, the conventional anthropological episteme on the inseparability of language and culture serves as another perspective from which other students justified their endorsement for Inner Circle culture in ELT (e.g., SI-18, SI-19, and SI-25).

As stated previously, 42.9% (6) of the 14 teachers also denied the potential threat to the development of traditional Chinese culture due to the emphasis on learning/teaching Inner Circle culture. When elaborating on this stance, they resorted to three variables, i.e., the educational politics in China, the enhanced critical cultural awareness of Chinese EFL learners, and the linguacultural landscape of China.

---

<sup>[14]</sup> The term, ‘Western culture’, is used interchangeably with ‘Inner Circle culture’ or the culture of the English speaking West by many interviewees in this study.

To be specific, two teachers (TI-1 and TI-4) argued that the emphasis on learning Inner Circle culture would not pose a threat to Chinese culture, asserting that students have developed a strong identification with their national culture due to the routinized patriotism education at schools of all levels in China. The firmness of their belief resides not only in their arguments but also in the unmodified predicates in the sentences they articulated. As TI-1 put it,

*Chinese students have been ... receiving patriotism education since they attended primary school. So, they are proud of their national culture. In learning English, they contact and understand another culture. This is conducive for expanding their horizons and intensifying their desire to communicate with the outside world. It will not affect their affections for their national culture.* (TI-1; Emphasis added)

In addition to the regular patriotism education, the cultivation of Chinese cultural identity has been given special emphasis in China's EFL education recently. According to TI-4, a large proportion of Chinese-English translation items in CET-4 and a higher level test, CET-6, have started to focus on Chinese culture. Such innovation in these national EFL examinations, she believe, "*is conducive for*" annihilating the (potential) threat of Inner Circle culture to the soundness of the traditional Chinese culture.

Two other teachers (TI-7 and TI-14) contended that the current enhancement of the critical cultural awareness on the part of many Chinese English language learners would make it impossible for Inner Circle to exert an oppression over Chinese culture, though they did not elaborate on the enhancement. In the words of TI-14,

*Now Chinese people are becoming more and more rational with regard to learning the English language and its culture. Learning English will make us become more and more aware of our own national identity, and then strive for transmitting Chinese culture.* (TI-14; Emphasis added)

Despite the optimism of TI-14 about the safety and development of traditional Chinese culture, the present continuous tense, "*are becoming ...*" and the present future, "*will make ...*" seem to indicate conversely the historical existence of the hegemony of Inner Circle culture and at least its present continuation in China.

Similar optimism can be seen in the comments made by the other two teachers (TI-12

and TI-13) in reference to the linguacultural landscape in China. They contended that “*it is impossible to produce*” (TI-12) cultural threat because English is a foreign language in China and the growing-up trajectory of Chinese English learners has created an indelible “*We are Chinese*” imprint in their mind. As TI-12 stated,

*English is a foreign language in China. It is impossible for it to produce an oppression over our culture [Chinese culture]. Even if we promote and endorse Anglo-American culture, we will not forget our own culture. Even if we follow their cultural norms when communicating with them (native English speakers), it is inevitable for us to introduce to them the quintessence of our own culture. We are Chinese, (TI-12; Emphasis added)*

Although insisting on the immunity of Chinese culture to the side effects of Inner Circle culture, TI-12 seemed to be unaware of the actual suppression of Inner Circle culture over Chinese culture, as pointed out by many scholars (e.g., Zhou, 2007). In the same vein, other teachers might not know that the patriotism education as well as related measures in CET-4 is in actuality a response of Chinese government and the upper management in education to the actual and potential English cultural imperialism (see Pan, 2015). In this sense, the denial of the threat to Chinese culture by those teachers seems to be sustained by common sense and a nationalism complex.

Reasons presented by the six administrators for their denial of the threat of Inner Circle culture were also found complicated. As with TI-12 and TI-13, A-8 displayed a strong confidence in the immunity of Chinese culture to Inner Circle culture, arguing that the cultural threat rhetoric is “*an exaggeration of the influence that Inner Circle culture exert on our students*” and “*a doubt about our confidence in our national culture*”. In his words,

*I feel we should have self-confidence. The culture of our country has never ceased over thousands of years. It has a mighty power. To take us as an example, we have studied English for so many years, and I feel it hasn’t produced very deep influence on us. I still feel Chinese culture takes up the leading position in our life ... For example, our viewpoints about family and love, and our expectations for our children to succeed, all represent our traditional cultural concepts ... So it is an alarmist talk to say that Western culture has brought about huge negative effects on us. (A-8; Emphasis added)*

In this comment, A-8 referred to the historical duration of Chinese culture as well as his personal examples to argue for the indelible existence of Chinese culture in the inner heart of Chinese people. Although his repetitive use of “*I feel*” may convey a tentative



stance, his concluding remark, “*it is an alarmist talk*”, signifies explicitly his strong opposition to the cultural threat thesis. However, as with TI-12, his stance can also said to be based primarily on common sense or a nationalism complex.

When arguing for the fallacious nature of the cultural threat rhetoric, A-5 resorted to a psycho-cognitive perspective on L1 culture transfer to prove the unshakable position of Chinese culture. However, he seemed to have ignored the long tradition in global ELT, including EFL education in China, that strongly denigrates the use of L1 culture and advocates the removal of its transfer (e.g., Kramsch, 1998).

Likewise, A-4 declared that the emphasis on Inner Circle culture in ELT would not result in a threat or an oppression over Chinese culture. She claimed that “*If it happened, the whole education system, particularly that for Chinese linguaculture Education in China*” should be blamed. In addition, A-3 and A-6 maintained that the promotion of Inner Circle culture in China through commercial activities, rather than EFL education, should be responsible for the threat to Chinese culture. However, they seemed unaware that EFL education is part of the entire educational system and part of the social life in China and cannot acquit itself from this accountability.

In contrast to the majority of the students and the administrators who denied the threat to Chinese culture, 57.1% (8) of the 14 teachers expressed agreement on this argument. This may help to explain in part why multicultural textbooks received wide support among the teacher participants in the questionnaire survey (see Section 7.3.2). As TI-11 stated,

The promotion of Inner Circle culture in ELT, particularly the entrenchment of English language textbooks in Western culture, *will* gradually lead to a [pro-nativeness] consciousness in the mind of learners. In turn, they *will* think and behave in accordance with Western cultural norms, and with time on, *will* alienate themselves from or even resist their own national culture. (TI-11; Emphasis added)

The use of the present future tense, as signified by the auxiliary word, “*will*”, represents TI-11’s belief that the emphasis on learning and teaching Inner Circle culture entails a potential threat to the ecology of Chinese culture. This viewpoint was found existing in the remarks of other interviewees who expressed agreement on the cultural threat thesis. However, different from T-11, who viewed this issue in a predictive manner, some

interviewees (e.g., TI-2, TI-3, and TI-5) stated that the dominant orientation toward Inner Circle culture in China's EFL education has already produced side effects on Chinese culture, particular on many Chinese English learners' identification with and competence in Chinese culture. In arguing for their viewpoints, they presented concrete examples, a strategy to legitimize discourse or ideology (see van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). For instance,

We need to realize that Western culture has its negative aspects and has produced immense side effects on the social values, worldviews and consumption views of many college students. For example, *they know more about Western festivals than traditional Chinese ones, and make frequent spelling mistakes with Chinese characters when writing essays in Chinese*. These [phenomena] can show the consequence of emphasizing Western culture in English language education. (TI-13; Emphasis added)

This section illustrates a matrix of the viewpoints expressed by the interviewees on whether the emphasis on Inner Circle culture, particularly Anglo-American in China's ELT entails a threat to the development of Chinese culture. Of the participants, most, especially the students and administrators, provided negative answers. Reasons they stated are related to their beliefs in Inner Circle culture as an advanced culture that deserves learning as well as in the immunity of Chinese culture and the patriotism education in China to the influence of outside cultures. By contrast, a certain number of participants, teachers in particular, regarded it as a source of threat or oppression. Some even provided concrete examples to illustrate the actual side effects. All these findings, alongside the pro-nativeness psyche prevalent among the three participants groups as presented in Sections 7.2 and 7.3, reveal that Inner Circle culture still enjoys strong support in China's ELT, though encountering resistance to a certain degree.

## **7.5 Discussion and summary**

This chapter explores the viewpoints of the three participant groups regarding the cultural orientations of EFL education in China. It also analyzes intergroup attitudinal (dis)similarities. Presented as follows is a summary of the major findings as well as the discussions thereof.

With regard to the question on the relationship between Inner Circle culture and English language learning, the majority of the participants upheld Inner Circle culture as the

bedrock of the English language and the point of reference in learning English. Major reasons for this ideological tendency were found residing in the conventional anthropological episteme about the inseparability of language and culture (Brown, 1994, 2007), the ideology of the nation-language-culture trinity (e.g., Anderson, 2006) and the belief that a good knowledge of Inner Circle culture is facilitative for learning English. At the same time, no significant difference was found between the students and the teachers, though the administrator group seemed to be more convinced about the inseparability of English language learning and Inner Circle culture. Furthermore, an unneglectable percent of the students and teachers displayed a “Not sure” stance.

In terms of whose/which culture the three stakeholder bodies expect to learn/teach, the vast majority of the participants upheld Inner Circle culture as the major learning target and/or teaching reference, though a small quantity of cultural information of other countries, particularly Chinese culture, is expected to be included in EFL textbooks. This is most pronounced among the administrators. Major reasons for prioritizing Inner Circle culture was found resonating with the traditional notion of the inseparability of language and culture. When justifying the inclusion of other cultures, most stakeholders resorted either to the logic of general educational effects, asserting the facilitative role that such textbooks play in helping students to learn different cultures and the English language, or to the logic of nationalism, i.e., transmitting Chinese culture to the world. It was noted that multicultural textbooks collected most support from the teacher participants.

As for whether the emphasis on learning/teaching Inner Circle culture in ELT entails a threat to or an oppression over Chinese culture, most of the students and administrators provided negative answers. Intergroup variations were found regarding the reasons they provided. The students as an entirety resorted to instrumentalism, claiming that Inner Circle culture can provide nutrients for the development of Chinese culture whereas most of the administrators and some teachers turned to the predominant presence of Chinese culture and the patriotism education in China to argue for the immunity of Chinese culture to outside cultural influences. Nevertheless, more than half of the teacher interviewees, expressed agreement on the cultural threat rhetoric.

In brief, the three participant groups as a whole were found upholding Inner Circle

culture as the bedrock of English and the point of reference in ELT. Most of them expected to acquire Inner Circle culture. They also denied that the emphasis on Inner Circle culture in China's ELT entails threat to Chinese culture. Indicated by all these findings, most of the participants were trapped in the conventional Native-speakerist ideology on cultural orientations of ELT. It seems that they had no knowledge or were unaware of the cultural politics surrounding this issue in ELT.

Regarding the predominant support of Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language, it seems that they did not realize the glocalization of the English language. As stated previously, English has developed into an international language or a worldwide lingua franca (e.g., Jenkins, 2007, 2015; McKay, 2002) and "can be used by anyone as a means to express any culture heritage and any value system" (Smith, 1987, as cited in Alptekin, 1993, p. 140). Meanwhile, most communications in English are currently conducted between or among NNSs with different cultural identities and in contexts or settings that bear no relevance to Inner Circle Culture (e.g., Cogo, 2012; Dewey & Jenkins, 2010; McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008). It follows that to uphold Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language and as the point of reference in learning and teaching English contradicts this sociolinguistic reality.

As for the support of EFL textbooks that concentrate on Inner Circle culture, they might have failed to perceive that the imbalanced representation of NS versus NNS cultures in ELT materials has generated and will perpetuate cultural inequalities, in particular between the Occident and the Orient (e.g., Matsuda, 2003a, 2006; McKay, 2003b). Part of reasons consist in that textbooks are usually upheld as an authoritative and legitimate source of knowledge (e.g., Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991). The more salient a culture is in textbooks, the more valuable it may be considered, and vice versa (e.g., Blum & Johnson, 2012; Duff & Uchida, 1997, as cited in Ilieva, 2000). This is also true of Inner Circle culture over-represented in most EFL textbooks. As a corollary, it has developed into the cultural proper in ELT. This may help to explain why most participant did not resort to cultural politics in justifying the incorporation of a small quantity of Outer and Expanding Circle culture into EFL textbooks.

Their unawareness of cultural politics can be considered existing in the instrumentalist perspective adopted by most of the student interviewees to deny the actual and potential

threat to Chinese culture engendered by the predominant support of or strong emphasis on Inner Circle culture in China's EFL education. When insisting on that Inner Circle culture can provide nutrients for the development of Chinese culture, they seemed to subscribe to the chauvinistic ideology that Inner Circle culture represents a modern and advanced culture, which other cultures need to imitate or learn in order to remedy their backwardness (e.g., Holliday, 2005, 2006; Phillipson, 1992, 2009). Meanwhile, the strong confidence of the teachers and administrators in the immunity of Chinese culture to and the patriotism education against the cultural threat may result in their continuing to uphold Inner Circle culture, strengthening conversely the actual and/or potential side effects on the ecology of Chinese culture (e.g., Niu & Wolff, 2003, 2005; Zhou, 2007).

The pro-nativeness findings stated above are supportive of the results of some previous studies, but contradict the outcomes of others (see Section 2.2.1). As with the findings on the nativeness versus nonnativeness issues to do with teachers and English language varieties (see Chapters 5 and 6), the strong pro-nativeness mentality to do with cultural orientations should be analyzed in reference to the Native-speakerist tradition of global ELT, in particular the sociocultural and historical political contexts surrounding EFL education in China.

The endorsement for Inner Circle culture as the learning/teaching reference and target, whether explicitly or implicitly, can be attributed to the legitimacy that has been granted to Inner Circle scholarship in ELT convention. Traditionally, relevant ELT theories emanating from Inner Circle countries are dominated by the anthropological episteme on the inseparability of language and culture (see Brown, 1994, 2007) as well as the expert discourse, such as Communicative Competence (Hymes, 1972), Acculturation Model (Schumann, 1986) and/or Integrative Motivation (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Underneath these theoretical purports, however, lurks a Native-speakerist ideology, which upholds Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language and the point of reference in ELT. Due to the historical-present academic hegemony of Inner Circle countries, all of these theories have been adopted indiscriminately as an authoritative guide or a legitimate yardstick for ELT research and practice in China. As noted earlier (see Section 1.4.3), 95% of the ELT research articles published in China from 2005 to 2010 take the cultivation of students' competence in intercultural communication simply as introducing to them the culture of Inner Circle countries (Gong, 2011, as cited

in Gong & Holliday, 2013). Meanwhile, most EFL textbooks are edited in accordance with Anglo-American culture (e.g., Gong, 2009; Wang, 2010). All of these discourses and practices inevitably have led to the constant reproduction of the pro-nativeness ideology, making the conformity to Inner Circle culture in ELT appear natural, normal and commonsensical. This may help to explain why the majority of the participants in this study regarded Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language and the point of reference in ELT and insisted that EFL textbooks should concentrate on Inner Circle culture.

That most of the participants denied the actual or potential threat to the development of Chinese culture out of the emphasis on Inner Circle culture in China's EFL education can be interpreted in reference to two interweaved ideologies in its EFL education policies, i.e., instrumental mentality and cultural nationalism. As stated previously (see Section 1.4), EFL education in China has been governed by the ideology of instrumentalism, with English upheld as a tool to access Western science and technology (e.g., Jin & Cortazzi, 2002, p. 54). Since China adopted the open and reform policy in late 1970s, to learn Inner Circle culture has also been advocated more strongly in its ELT policies than before (Chen, 2011). For instance, the national English syllabus for secondary school students (1986) states that English is "an important tool for learning cultural and scientific knowledge" (translated by Adamson & Morris, 1997, p. 16). This instrumental ideology is stated more explicitly in the syllabus issued recently, such as *College English Teaching Guideline* (2017) (MOE, 2017), as a response to the increasingly globalized world. It seems that "English is similar to mathematics or physics and without any potential cultural implications" (Pan, 2015, p. 66) and learning English is for national construction and personal development (Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992). At the same time, a nationalist stance with regard to Chinese culture, i.e., cultural nationalism has been reproduced constantly in the historical process of ELT in China. The principle advocated in the initial phase of China's ELT history, i.e., "Chinese Learning for fundamentals, Western Learning for practice", has never ceased to function as the ideological guidance for EFL education in China (e.g., Chen, 2011). Underneath this principle lies an ideology that advocates the superiority of Chinese culture and the necessity for learners of English to retain their Chinese identity (Jin & Cortazzi, 2002, p. 54). In this sense, these two ideological orientations may account for why most of the participants denied the actual and potential cultural threat brought

about by the promotion of Inner Circle culture in ELT.

Despite the prevalent denial of the hegemony of Inner Circle culture among the three participant groups, a certain number of participants expressed agreement on it. This could be regarded in part as a response to the scholarship on the “English language threat discussion” (Pan & Seargeant, 2012, p. 60) that has been launched since the late 1990s or to the calls of the Chinese government and a popular scholarly argument for transmitting Chinese culture to the world (see Wen, 2012b). Meanwhile, it may be a result of their realizing the actual side effects of Inner Circle culture on the linguacultural ecology in China. As mentioned previously (see Section 7.4), 57.1% (8) of the 14 teacher interviewees expressed agreement on the cultural threat purport. However, only two students and two administrators held the same viewpoint. The difference between the teachers and the students may reside in that the former have more accessibility to the updated critical scholarship whereas the latter tend to focus more on acquiring the “four skills” (Holliday, 2005) – listening, speaking, reading and listening, a regular practice in learning English for non-English-major undergraduates in China (e.g., Pan & Block, 2011). This line of thought may also help to explain why a higher percent of teachers selected EFL textbooks, in which the cultural information of Inner Circle countries, Outer Circle countries and China is equally distributed (see Tables 7.7 and 7.8). However, it is hard to explain the difference in attitude between the teachers and the administrators in these respects, with further studies therefore warranted.

It is also a puzzle that an unneglectable percent of the students and teachers selected the “Not sure” answer to the Likert scale statements in praise of Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of English and the learning/teaching reference/target in ELT (see Sections 7.2). Arguably, this finding represents the ambivalence of those students and teachers produced by the conflicts between the traditional Native-speakerist discourse in support of Inner Circle culture and the discourse on the glocalization of English and cultural politics in ELT (e.g., Jenkins, 2007; Pennycook, 1994). That those students and teachers were lack of the knowledge on this issue may also lead to the central choice tendency (Chan, 2017). In light of complexity of this choice, future studies are warranted.

All of the major findings presented in this chapter suggest the prevalence of a strong

pro-nativeness ideology in relation to cultural orientations of ELT among the three participant groups, who, as an entirety, seemed to subjugate themselves to the Native-speakerist specter. However, some participants, though small in proportion, have started to realize the actual and potential threat to Chinese culture generated out of the strong emphasis on learning/teaching Inner Circle culture in China's EFL education. Albeit that, there is still a long way to go before the great awake of ELT stakeholders.



## **Chapter 8 Opinions about Communicative Language Teaching Approach**

### **8.1 Introduction**

In addition to the predominant support of NESTs, Inner Circle English and Inner Circle culture, teaching approaches that emanate from Inner Circle countries, *inter alia*, CLT, have been accepted and promoted as the best pedagogical approach in many Outer and Expanding Circle countries (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Nunan, 2003). Terms related to CLT “like ‘communicative approach’, ‘learner-centredness’ and ‘group work’ have long become for many non-native teachers and learners synonymous with progress, modernization, and access to wealth” (Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996, p. 200). This is also true of EFL education in China (see Section 1.1). However, CLT has been encountering a plethora of scholarly attacks (e.g., Akbari, 2008; Holliday, 2005; Kumaravadivelu, 2012). In order to find out whether – if so, to what extent – EFL education in China is still affected by Native-speakerism in this respect, this chapter analyzes the responses of the three groups of participants to the question items surrounding Research Question 4, i.e., the opinions of students, teachers and administrators on CLT. It also explores intergroup (dis)similarities, answering in part Research Question 5 (see Section 1.3).

The whole chapter consists of five sections. Following the introduction (Section 8.1), Section 8.2 analyzes the perceptions of the three stakeholder groups on the merits of CLT in respect of education philosophy and pedagogical effect. Section 8.3 explores their opinions about whether classroom instruction should follow CLT. Section 8.4 dissects the stakeholders’ awareness of the discrimination against the traditional education culture of China brought about by the promotion of CLT in China’s EFL education. In analyzing the data appertaining to each of these issues, inter-group (dis)similarities in opinion were also compared. This chapter concludes with a discussion and summary of the major findings presented in the preceding sections.

### **8.2 Perceived merits of CLT**

Regarding the perceptions of the three participant groups on CLT, data were collected

through relevant Likert scale statements utilized in the questionnaire surveys (Items 9-12 for students; Items 19, 20, 21 and 23 for teachers) and related questions employed in the interviews (Item 9 for students; Item 12 for teachers; Items 13 for administrators). Presented as follows are the findings based on the analysis of the data.

### 8.2.1 CLT as the representative of a sophisticated education philosophy

In respect of philosophical foundation, most of the participants regarded CLT as a teaching approach representing a sophisticated or advanced education philosophy. This is evident both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

Table 8.1 summarizes the statistics collected through a Likert scale question (Item 9) on whether CLT is more advanced in education philosophy than the traditional teacher-centered instructional approach in China <sup>[15]</sup>. The majority of the students displayed an affirmative stance, as is evidenced by the average total mean ( $3.51 \pm 1.086$ ) and the percentage (53.8%) for the students in (strong) agreement on this Likert scale statement. Notably, only 15.4% expressed oppositions, but 30.8% selected the “Not sure” answer.

Table 8.1 Students’ opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of education philosophy

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 9. Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the student-centered CLT approach from native English speaking countries represents an advanced education philosophy.	6.2%	9.2%	30.8%	35.3%	18.5%	3.51	1.086

Notes: N = 817; SD = standard deviation

<sup>[15]</sup> The traditional teacher-centered instructional approach in China is believed to be the product of Confucianism (e.g., Liu, 1998). Usually, teachers are regarded as the owners of knowledge and students should respect their teachers and listen to them attentively in class. It is thereby generally asserted that this approach nurtures a hierarchical student-teacher relationship and prevents the development of students’ initiatives (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b). Nevertheless, this belief goes against some tenets of Confucianism that advocate the constructive nature of knowledge and the equality between teacher and students in knowledge (e.g., Cheng, 2000, 2002). Although the student-centered classroom activity is claimed to be a benchmark of CLT (e.g., Bax, 2003), CLT does not rule out teacher-centered methods in classroom teaching (see Doughty & Williams, 1998). As such, the perception of ELT stakeholders in line with this dichotomization of these two approaches can be regarded as an ideological product. This is exactly what this study intends to explore.

The perceptions of teacher participants on this issue are reflected in their responses to Question Item 21. The statistics collected (Table 8.2) indicates a prevalent support of CLT within the teachers, as is evidenced by the mean ( $3.93 \pm 0.919$ ) for their overall attitudinal tendency and the percentage (73.5%) for those in (strong) agreement on this Likert scale statement. By contrast, only 7.4% of the teachers expressed oppositions. As with the students, a certain percent of the teachers (19.1%) chose the “Not sure” answer. However, it is about 10% lower than that for the students (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.2 Teachers’ opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of education philosophy

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 21. Compared with the traditional English language teaching mode in China, CLT approach represents a sophisticated education philosophy.	1.5%	5.9%	19.1%	45.6%	27.9%	3.93	0.919

Notes: N =68; CLT = communicative language teaching approach; SD = standard deviation

The statistics presented in Tables 8.1 and 8.2 suggests a strong identification with the philosophical foundation of CLT within the two participant groups. Nevertheless, the intergroup difference in average mean seems to show that the teacher group were more convinced that CLT represents an advanced education philosophy. This is confirmed by the results of the Independent Samples t-test presented in Table 8.3 ( $p < 0.05$ ), the magnitude of the difference approximating the medium level ( $d = 0.42$ ).

Table 8.3 Independent Samples t-test of the opinions of students and teachers about CLT in respect of education philosophy

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation					
3.51	1.086	3.93	0.919	3.574	83.37	0.01	0.421	0.42

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen’s d

During the interviews, the 26 students were asked directly whether CLT stemming from the English speaking West represents a modern education philosophy in comparison with the traditional teaching approach in China (Question Item 9). As with the pro-finding discovered through the questionnaire survey, the qualitative data suggest that

88.5% (23) of the students granted a high prestige to CLT in this regard.

In justifying this stance, most of the students resorted to the perspective that education philosophy is nurtured by the socioculture where it is embedded. They argued that Inner Circle countries has a sociocultural tradition that values creativity and individualism whereas the sociocultural culture of China advocates obedience. Following this logic, they concluded that the education philosophy of Inner Circle countries is “modern” and “advanced” whereas that of China is “backward” (e.g., SI-5; SI-13). This dichotomous perception is evident from the content of their comments, particularly the words and expressions they adopted to describe the sociocultures, education philosophies and teaching approaches of Inner Circle countries and those of China; the strength of their stance is achieved through the unmodified predicates. For instance,

The education philosophy featured with a pioneering spirit sprouted initially in Western countries. This is because these countries have a long tradition of being open to the outside world. However, it is not until recently that China has been open to the world. Because China has been self-isolated for a long time, *its education philosophy is comparatively ossified, falling into the spoon-fed type*. Education is influenced by society, and therefore *teaching approaches of Western countries is more open and advanced*. (SI-15; Emphasis added)

When answering Question Item 12, the same as Question 9 for the students, 85.7% (12) of the 14 teacher interviewees also accorded a superior status to CLT in respect of philosophical foundation. As with the students, they developed their argument from the perspective of social construction of education. To be specific, they stated that CLT represents the sociopolitical or sociocultural ethos of Inner Circle countries, i.e., the spirit of equality, individuality and criticality. Implied conversely is the inferiority of the socioculture of China and the educational philosophy thereof. Similar to that of the students, the firmness of the teachers’ positioning is also reflected by the unmodified predicates, alongside the words and expressions that assign different semantic values to these two teaching approaches. For instance,

This type of teaching approach [CLT] represents the traditional social culture of Western countries, *which advocates equality, attaches attention to the cultivation of individuality, and emphasizes the enhancement of [students’] critical thinking ability*. (TI-5; Emphasis added)

The opinions held by the eight administrators regarding this issue can be seen from their

responses to Question Item 13, the same in content as Item 9 for students and Item 12 for teachers. Suggested by the data, 75% (6) of the administrators articulated that CLT represents an advanced modern education philosophy. Compared in percentage with the students and teachers participating in the questionnaire surveys (see Tables 8.1 and 8.2), it seems that the administrators were similar to the teacher group in attitudinal tendency but more supportive of CLT than were the students.

As with most of the students and teachers, 83.3% (5) of the six administrators resorted to the perspective on social construction of education to justify their support of CLT. They claimed that CLT represents the sociocultural factors of Inner Circle countries that advocates critical awareness and individualism. The strength of their belief is also apparent from the linguistic devices in their remarks, such as declarative sentence, present tense and non-modified predicates. As A-1 put it,

Inner Circle teaching approaches, such as CLT, represent their social cultures to a great degree. They encourage students to think critically, to express their own ideas, and to challenge the traditional authoritative knowledge. (A-1)

In addition to the general sociocultural milieu, these administrators emphasized the contribution of the sociopolitical environment to formulating the philosophical basis of education. To be specific, they contended that the sociopolitical context of Inner Circle countries nurtures the spirit of democracy, which in turn constitutes the sociopolitical foundation of teaching approaches, particularly CLT (see Holliday, 2005). For instance,

*This teaching approach reflects the political beliefs in democracy, freedom and pursuit of truth in Western countries*, as education is inseparable from politics. For example, Dewey wrote a book, *Democracy and Education* to introduce his education philosophies. (A-3; Emphasis added)

The exemplary excerpts as well as the statistical data presented in this subsection indicate that the three participant groups as a whole upheld CLT as a teaching approach representing a sophisticated education philosophy. This seemed to be more evident among the teachers and administrators. While praising the philosophical foundation of CLT, they viewed the conventional education philosophy in China and its concomitant pedagogical approaches as being backward, ossified and destitute of creativity.

### 8.2.2 CLT as an approach conducive for achieving optimal teaching effects

In addition to probing into the opinions of the three participant groups about CLT in respect of education philosophy, their perception on teaching effects of CLT vis-à-vis those of the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China were investigated. By teaching effect, it refers in this thesis to both the affective and cognitive experiences that students and teachers undergo in the classroom teaching and learning process.

The overall perception of the student group on this issue can be observed from the statistics presented in Table 8.4, which summarizes their responses to three Likert scale statements on whether the application of CLT to classroom teaching can improve the student-teacher relationship, stimulate students' learning interests and enhance their English proficiency (Items 10-12).

Table 8.4 Students' opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of teaching effect

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 10. Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the application of the student-centered CLT approach of native English speaking countries is conducive for creating a democratic classroom atmosphere.	4.7%	7.7%	22.6%	43.5%	21.5%	3.70	1.038
Item 11. Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the application of the student-centered CLT approach of native English speaking countries is conducive for enhancing students learning interests.	4.4%	9.9%	25.7%	39.5%	20.4%	3.62	1.053
Item 12. Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the application of the student-centered CLT approach of native English speaking countries is conducive for improving students' oral English proficiency.	5.5%	7.6%	24.7%	40.8%	21.4%	3.65	1.068
Total	3.2%	7.5%	26.6%	45.7%	17.1%	3.66	0.953

Note: N = 817; CLT = communicative language teaching; SD = standard deviation

Suggested by the statistics reported in this table, a strong support of CLT prevailed among the student participants. This is apparent from the mean ( $3.66\pm0.953$ ) for this question cluster and the overall percentage (62.8%) for the students who expressed (strong) agreement. It is noted that the claim that CLT helps to construct a democratic classroom atmosphere (Item 10) collected the strongest support ( $3.70\pm1.038$ ). However, a small average total percent (10.7%) of the students displayed oppositions. Despite the overall support of CLT, more than a quarter (26.6%) of the students selected the “Not sure” answer.

The opinions of the teachers regarding whether CLT is more likely to achieve optimal teaching effects are observable from their responses to three Likert scale questions (Items, 19, 20 and 23). Table 8.5 presents the statistics concerning the responses of the teacher participants to these three question items.

Table 8.5 Teachers’ opinions about the merits of CLT in respect of teaching effect

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	SD
Item 19. Compared with the traditional English language teaching mode in China, CLT can help to stimulate students’ learning interests.	1.5%	10.3%	16.2%	54.4%	17.6%	3.76	0.916
Item 20. Compared with the traditional English language teaching mode in China, CLT can put students in the center of learning.	0.0%	4.4%	23.5%	48.5%	23.5%	3.91	0.805
Item 23. It is uncertain that CLT helps to improve students’ English language proficiency. (reversed)	0.0%	7.4%	32.4%	41.2%	19.1%	3.72	0.861
Total	0.0%	2.9%	25.0%	52.9%	19.1%	3.88	0.744

Notes: N = 68; CLT = communicative language teaching approach; SD = standard deviation

Similar to the attitudinal propensity of the student group, a predominant support of CLT was found prevailing among most of the teachers. This is obvious from the mean ( $3.88\pm0.744$ ) for this question cluster as well as the average total percentage (72%) for the teachers in (strong) agreement on the value of CLT. In addition, the statement (Item 20) on the merit of CLT in constructing a student-centered learning mode and then establishing, by implication, an equal student-teacher relationship, enjoyed the

strongest support within the teacher group ( $3.91 \pm 0.805$ ). This seems to agree with the major concern of the students (Item 10; Table 8.4). Notably, only 2.9% of the teachers expressed oppositions but a quarter selected the “Not sure” answer.

The statistical findings presented in Tables 8.4 and 8.5 suggest a similar attitudinal tendency among these two participant groups. However, the intergroup difference in average mean seems to indicate that the teacher group was more supportive of CLT. This is verified by the results of the Independent Samples t-test reported in Table 8.6 ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, the magnitude of the effect size is not great ( $d = 0.25$ ).

Table 8.6 Independent Samples t-test of the opinions of students and teachers about CLT in respect of teaching effect

Students (N=817)		Teachers (N = 68)		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	d
Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	2.303	86.43	0.02	0.221	0.25
3.66	0.953	3.88	0.744					

Note: df = degree of freedom; d = Cohen's d

The statistical data presented above in this subsection are suggestive of a predominant support of CLT. It becomes more evident with the analysis of the data collected through interviews with most interviewees, as represented by the content of their talks as well as the discursive strategies and linguistic forms they adopted.

When answering Question Item 9, all of the 26 student interviewees expressed a strong belief in the capability of CLT to achieve optimal teaching effects. In justifying this stance, they resorted to the prevalent discourse on the learner-centered principle in ELT, maintaining that CLT represents the constructionist conception on learning, namely, knowledge is constructed through social or classroom activities, such as peer or group work rather than being possessed and imparted by teachers (see Vygotsky, 1978; Wink, 2011). In particular, they argued that the “student-centered” teaching and learning mode advocated by CLT helps to establish an equitable student-teacher relationship. This corroborates the strongest support granted by the students in the questionnaire survey to the Likert scale statement on the capability of CLT to build up a democratic classroom (Item 10) (see Table 8.4). In the exemplifying excerpt cited below, SI-7



portrayed discursively the democratic and equitable classroom milieu brought about by CLT. The features of such a classroom are evident linguistically by the antithesis, “... *does not mean one-way knowledge transmission ... it means reciprocal communications*” as well as the paralleled unmodified predicates, “*learn from each other, supplement each other, and enrich each other*”.

CLT can create a relaxed classroom atmosphere, in which a harmonious and equitable relationship can be established between students and teachers. In this type of class, *the student-teacher relationship does not mean one-way knowledge transmission. Rather, it means reciprocal communications*. During discussions and questionings [about certain topics], students and teachers can *learn from each other, supplement each other, and enrich each other* [in certain knowledge arenas]. (SI-7; Emphasis added)

When answering Question Item 12 during interviews, 12 (85.7%) of the 14 teacher interviewees also expressed strong endorsement for CLT. In addition to the benefit articulated by the students – building up a democratic student-teacher relationship, they stated that CLT helps to exercise students’ mind, make them responsible for their own studies and improve their English proficiency. As TI-11 put it affirmatively,

This teaching approach [CLT] is very effective. *If* you decide on taking the task-based strategy in class and design some tasks for students to complete, students *can* activate their thoughts to think about the tasks and get more chances to put their English into use. *If* teachers only deliver lectures without giving students tasks and without letting them participate [in classroom discussion], the class falls into the spoon-fed type or the traditional teaching mode. *It is hard* for students to concentrate their mind on teachers and follow the thoughts of teachers ... students *need* to think about the progress of their study and manage their own study according to their own thoughts, and *need* more chances to use English in class. (TI-11; Emphasis added)

The arguments of TI-11 for the pedagogical effects of CLT seem to resonate with the widely advocated benefits of “learner autonomy” (Holec, 1981, p. 3) in ELT, i.e., the ability of learners to control their own English learning process and even the English proficiency they attain ultimately (Cotterall, 2000, p. 109). In TI-11’s opinion, the task-based activities, particularly those that require teamwork or group efforts of the students can help them to develop the capability to conduct autonomous learning. By contrast, she denied explicitly the value of the traditional teacher-centered pedagogical mode. This polarized perception is represented by the antithetical sentences initiated by “*If*”; the strength of her belief is reflected in the modal verbs – “*can*” and “*need*” in these sentences. Although other interviewees, such as those cited above, did not express their

opinions in line with the “comparison and contrast” rhetorical pattern, they took the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China as a default target for comparison.

When answering Question Item 13, six (75%) of the eight administrators stated that CLT is conducive for creating optimal teaching effects. Compared in percentage with the overall attitudinal tendency of the students and teachers discovered through the questionnaire surveys (see Tables 8.4 and 8.5), it seems that the administrators were similar to the teachers in attitude, but more positive toward CLT than the students.

To be specific, the six administrators argued that CLT is helpful for establishing an equitable or democratic student-teacher relationship, enhancing their learning interests and improving their English proficiency. Moreover, they regarded the learner-centered principle of CLT as the foundation for all these merits, asserting that CLT provides students with abundant chances for them to participate in classroom interactions. In the words of A-1,

In this type of [CLT] class, *students have more interactions and negotiations with their teachers*. This is conducive for constructing an equal student-teacher relationship. Since they have a higher degree of participation in this type of class, they can experience the joy of learning, which in turn is helpful for stimulating their learning interests and then improving their English proficiency. (A-1; Emphasis added)

As indicated in the exemplary excerpts as well as the quantitative data presented in this subsection, the three groups as a whole tended to uphold CLT as an approach conducive for achieving optimal teaching effects, such as increasing students’ learning interests, improving their English proficiency and establishing an equitable student-teacher relationship. These merits were claimed to derive from its learner-centered principle. It was also found that this attitudinal propensity has a stronger momentum among the teachers and the administrators. All these findings, in tandem with the predominant support of CLT as the representative of a sophisticated education philosophy, are suggestive of a strong pro-nativeness mentality prevailed among the three groups of participants. Notwithstanding that, a certain percent of the participants chose the “Not sure” answers to the Likert scale statements.

### 8.3 Attitudes toward the application of CLT to classroom instruction

As revealed in above section, the three participant groups as a whole regarded CLT as an advanced teaching approach. In view of the mixed attitudes toward the application of CLT to classroom instruction discovered among the students and teachers in many previous empirical studies (see Section 2.2.1), it is much of necessity to explore the related views of the participants in this study. Given the theoretical questionings on the suitability of Inner Circle teaching methodology in Outer and Expanding Circle countries (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2006), it is more valuable to probe into this issue. In this section, relevant opinions of the three groups of participants are dissected.

The opinions of the students and teachers can be observed from their responses to two multi-choice questions (Item 25 for students; Item 30 for teachers). In each item, four teaching approaches are provided for choice. Approach A stands for CLT stemming from Inner Circle countries whilst Approach B refers to the traditional teacher-centered pedagogical mode in China. Approach C refers to the teaching model that relies on CLT, supplemented by the traditional teacher-centered instructional strategy. Approach D follows the traditional teacher-centered instructional approach, with CLT as a minor supplement <sup>[16]</sup>. In addition to indicating their most favorite teaching modes, the participants were required to supply reasons for their choices.

Table 8.7 summarizes in statistics the choices by the student participants. Approach C enjoyed the strongest support, as is apparent from the support granted to it by 37.3% of the students. Ranked second is Approach A, supported by 30.6% of the students. 24.0% of the students chose Approach D; the smallest favor was accorded to Approach B.

Table 8.7 Students' opinions about the ideal EFL teaching approach

Item 25. Of Teaching approaches A/B/C/D, which one do you expect most your teacher to adopt?	A	B	C	D	Total
Students (N=817)	30.6% (250)	7.7% (63)	37.7% (308)	24.0% (196)	100%

<sup>[16]</sup> As stated in Note 15, I am aware that CLT does not rule out teacher-centered strategies in classroom teaching (see Doughty & Williams, 1998). The division of CLT and the traditional teacher-center approach in these questions merely follows the dominant discourse in support of the dichotomization of these two teaching approaches.

The opinions of the teacher participants on this issue are evident from the statistics presented in Table 8.8. As with the student group, Approach C received the strongest support from the teachers (50%). At the same time, more than one fourth of the teachers (26.5%) expressed preferences for Approach A. By contrast, the other two teaching approaches enjoyed much less support.

Table 8.8 Teachers' opinions about the ideal EFL teaching approach

Item 30. Of Teaching approaches A/B/C/D, which one do you expect most to adopt?	A	B	C	D	Total
Students (N=68)	26.5% (18)	4.4% (3)	50.0% (34)	19.1% (13)	100%

Based on the statistics presented in Table 8.7 and 8.8, it is apparent that both the students and teachers expressed support to CLT. In particular, they expected classroom instruction to follow the mixed teaching approach that adopts CLT, with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China as a supplement. Statistical comparison seems to show that the teacher group was more inclined to follow the mixed approach.

Regarding the selection of Approach A, reasons were provided by 40.4% (101) of the 250 students and 72.2% (13) of the 18 teachers; as for the support of Approach C, 56.8% (175) of the 308 students and 92% (46) of the 50 teachers elaborated on their stance (see also Tables 8.7 and 8.8). The analysis of the reasons displays a pro-nativeness attitude as well as a complicated mentality to do with the supplement of the traditional teacher-centered pedagogical approach to CLT.

As noted previously (see Section 8.2.2), most of the participants regarded CLT as a pedagogical approach conducive for achieving optimal teaching effects, such as increasing students' learning interests, improving their English proficiency and establishing an equitable student-teacher relationship. These perceived merits were also articulated by 62.4% (63) of the 101 students and 72.2% (13) of the 18 teachers for choosing Approach A, and by 44% (77) of the 175 students and 92% (46) of the 50 teachers for selecting Approach C.

As for the incorporation of the traditional teacher-centered approach as a supplement

to CLT, 47.4% (83) of the 175 students claimed that such pedagogical practice is easier for Chinese students to accept because it takes into account the teaching and learning culture of China. However, most of them stated, “*There should be a transition phase between the two teaching approaches*” (e.g., S-318, S-327 or S-446). Implied in this standpoint is that the incorporation of some ingredients of the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach is an expediency before the complete implementation of CLT in classroom teaching. For those students, it seems that the traditional teacher-centered approach in China is defective and needs replacing by CLT completely in the future.

Of the 46 teachers who selected Approach C, 50% (23) also stated that it is inappropriate to apply CLT completely to classroom teaching in China at the present stage. When elaborating on this choice, they presented two concrete reasons. One rests with the educational system in China, in particular its standardized English examination mechanism, which attaches less attention to students’ oral communicative competence, resulting in students’ perception of CLT as being less practical and the attendant reluctance to accept this teaching approach. The other is related to the assumed reticent state of mind of Chinese students, which, they claimed, constitutes the application of CLT. In the words of T-26,

After all, the examination mechanism in China determines that the learner-centered approach cannot be implemented completely because *it does not focus on students’ oral skills*, and at the same time, that *Chinese students are conservative* also determines the impossibility to implement this approach completely. (T-26; Emphasis added)

The recourse to the examination system resonates with one of the major reasons for opposing CLT among ELT practitioners as summarized by Littlewood (2014), “Teachers often face a contradiction between official policies which advocate CLT and a pencil-and-paper examination system which tests discrete items” (p. 353). However, oral communication in English has gained more attention in the EFL examination system in China in recent years. At the same time, Chinese students do appear to be quiet in class, but this does not mean they lack critical thinking ability. Their reticence observed in class can be ascribed to the influence of Confucianism or their insufficient competence in English (e.g., Cheng, 2000). In this sense, the ideological stance revealed in this exemplifying excerpt actually represents the traditional Native-speakerist notion

in ELT on Outer and Expanding Circle education culture and their students (see Holliday, 2006, p. 386). To be specific, the testing system and by extension the whole education culture in China is backward and Chinese students are reticent, uncritical and incapable to accept CLT. It is noted that those teachers' blame on the students for obstructing the implementation of CLT does not agree with the strong endorsement with the student group for this pedagogical approach to be applied to classroom teaching (see Table 8.7).

Of the students and teachers who selected Approach D, only a small percent of them supplied reasons, which are similar to those provided for the selection of Approach C. Notwithstanding the limited data, it is evident that they identified with the merits of CLT to a certain extent.

The viewpoints of the administrators can be observed from their responses to Question Item 14 (Do you recommend or require your fellow teachers to shift from the traditional teacher-centered approach to CLT in classroom teaching?). When asked this question, 75% (6) of the eight administrators insisted on the overarching guidance of CLT for classroom teaching. They also stated that CLT should be supplemented with the conventional teacher-centered approach in China. Compared with the students and teachers in percentage, the administrators seemed to hold a much stronger preference for this mixed teaching model.

In justifying the application of the mixed approach, the six administrators all turned to the traditional hierarchical educational culture in China as well as the professional incompetence of Chinese EFL teachers. In their view, the major obstacle preventing the thorough application of CLT lies in the conservative mentality of the teachers about the student-teacher relationship and their low motivation or even inability to cope with the pedagogical reformation. Referencing the actual CE reform at his university, A-8 stated,

According to our observation [during the process of our teaching reform], although many teachers agree on the merits of CLT, their agreement is not as strong as that of their students. This is because those teachers *have become accustomed to the way they dominated the classroom talk*. In face of the sudden change, they *may be unwilling to shift their thoughts*, on the one hand, and *may not know how to change*, on the other hand. In addition, they *may be afraid that their authority will be challenged* if students become more familiar with them. (A-8; Emphasis added)

Similar to the previous stigmatizing comments on Chinese students, the descriptions of the teachers in this exemplifying excerpt agree with the conventional Native-speakerist conceptions of NNESTs, who are usually considered unable to manage the “active, collaborative, and self-directed ‘learner-centred’ teaching–learning techniques” [due to their] ‘dependent’, ‘hierarchical’, ‘collectivist’, ‘reticent’, ‘indirect’, ‘passive’, ‘docile’, ‘lacking in self-esteem’ [cultures]” (Holliday, 2006, p. 385). Meanwhile, the blame on the teachers in hindering the implementation of CLT forms a sharp contrast to the strong endorsement for adopting this teaching approach for classroom teaching within the teacher participant group (see Table 8.8). Notwithstanding this mismatch as well as that between the teachers and the students, it can be concluded that most of the participants were convinced that there are many defects with the traditional education culture of China, Chinese students and/or teachers, which prevent the complete application of CLT to classroom instruction.

All of the findings presented above suggest that CLT was upheld as the overarching guidance for ELT practice by most of the participants. Although anticipating the supplement of CLT with the traditional teacher-centered approach in China’s ELT, most of the participants seemed to ascribe this choice to the defect of Chinese students, teachers and education system. In this logic, to supplement CLT with some ingredients of the traditional teacher-centered approach is either an expedient strategy or a helpless choice, though it can be said to represent in a sense the consciousness of appropriation on the part of those participants (see Berman, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999b; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996).

#### **8.4 Awareness of CLT as a reflection of pedagogical discrimination**

Observed from the two preceding sections, most of the participants granted prestige to CLT while denigrating the traditional teacher-center approach in China. It seems they did not realize that the polarization entails discrimination against the latter and by extension the traditional education culture of China. In light of the strong promotion of CLT in China as well as the cultural politics underlying teaching methodology, this section focuses on their cognizance in this regard. Data were collected through a

question <sup>[17]</sup> addressed respectively to the three groups in interviews (Whether the strong promotion of CLT in China's ELT entails a type of discrimination against or an oppression over the traditional education culture of China?).

Indicated by the data, the overwhelming majority of the participants provided negative answers. 96.2% (25) of the 26 student interviewees stated explicitly that the promotion of Inner Circle teaching approaches, particularly CLT, does not entail any pedagogical discrimination. 71.4% (10) of the 14 teachers and 62.5% (5) of the eight administrators also subscribed to this viewpoint. Further analysis of the data reveals an instrumentalist mentality among those participants, as is evident from the logic of "learning from the better" and "reciprocal complement" they adopted to develop their arguments.

The logic, "learning from the better", justifies to a great extent the predominant support of CLT among the three groups of participants as discussed in Sections 8.2 and 8.3, namely, CLT represents a sophisticated education philosophy and helps to generate optimal teaching effects. The 25 students resorted to these two types of perceived merits of CLT to justify its promotion in China's EFL education. The ten teachers and the five administrators elaborated on their standpoint primarily from the perspective of teaching effects, asserting that CLT is conducive for rectifying the passivity or inertia of many Chinese students in study. Implied conversely in the praise of CLT is that the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach should be responsible for this unsatisfactory psychological and behavioral state of the students. In the words of A-7,

All teaching approaches should aim at improving teaching effects and stimulating students' learning interests. Currently, many students at Chinese universities do not love learning, have weak learning interests and only take passing examinations as the ultimate goal of their study. They think it is fine if they can get graduation certificates. [Meanwhile,] the classroom atmosphere is depressing and classroom attendance is low. *I think the teaching approaches imported from Inner Circle countries, particularly CLT, can help to change this status quo.* (A-7; Emphasis added)

In addition to the micro perspective on the merit of promoting CLT, i.e., stimulating the motivation of students in study, a macro viewpoint can be observed from the comments made by those interviewees. They asserted that the promotion of CLT helps

---

<sup>[17]</sup> This question is encoded as Item 10 for the students, Item 13 for the teachers and Item 15 for the administrators (See Appendices 3-5).



to improve the teacher-centered teaching methodology and even the traditional education culture of China, and thereby CLT should serve as a model teaching approach to follow. As SI-8 stated in a matter-of-the-fact manner,

*It is not a kind of pedagogical imperialism. Western teaching approaches indeed have their own merits whereas there are many defects in the teaching approaches of our country. The promotion of the former is helpful for the development of the latter ... In this way, our education culture will be improved.* (SI-8; Emphasis added)

In addition to these one-way benefits of CLT, rectifying the unsatisfactory state of Chinese students and improving the traditional teaching methodology in China and its education culture, other participants, including seven students, six teachers and four administrators, turned to the logic of “reciprocal complement” to argue that the promotion of CLT has nothing to do with discrimination. In their view, the promotion of CLT helps to facilitate the exchanges between these two different teaching approaches, which, they claimed, should be integrated in ELT because the two approaches have their respective (de)merits and can enrich or supplement each other. In the words of TI-1,

*This does not mean any discrimination. Both Eastern and Western education cultures have their respective characteristics and advantages. The traditional [teacher-centered] teaching approach in China is helpful for students to acquire [declarative] knowledge whereas CLT is beneficial for improving students’ critical thinking ability and problem-analysis ability. It is a good choice to consolidate the foundation of [declarative] knowledge and at the same time to improve the ability of practice.* (TI-1; Emphasis added)

Underneath this seemingly multiculturalist standpoint expressed in this exemplifying excerpt is the reproduction of the discriminatory stereotypical image that Chinese students are passive, dull and destitute of critical thinking ability and that education in China only emphasizes the transmission of declarative knowledge (e.g., Holliday, 2006; Kubota & Lin, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2012). By contrast, none of the participants presented any concrete weak point of CLT, though they stated that CLT has its own weakness. In this sense, they seemed to be unaware that the exchange or communication does not operate on an equal basis. This conclusion would be more understandable, if viewed against the opinion shared by most of the participants that the ideal teaching mode should follow CLT, but take the traditional teacher-centered approach in China as a supplement (see Section 8.3).

Despite the pervasive viewpoint that the promotion of CLT entails no discrimination against the traditional education culture of China, oppositional voices could also be heard. To be specific, one student, four teachers and three administrators provided affirmative answers to this question. Furthermore, they deemed it regretful that China has not developed pedagogical theories and approaches in line with its own the sociocultural context, albeit the immense size of its ELT enterprise.

Observed from the findings presented in this section, the vast majority of the participants claimed that the promotion of CLT in China's EFL education has nothing to do with pedagogical discrimination or prejudice. This is most evident among the student interviewees. Despite some voices attacking the pedagogical discrimination, they are weak in strength. All these findings indicate that the three participant groups as an entirety considered it natural, normal and beneficial to promote CLT in China's ELT, corroborating thereby the findings presented in Sections 8.2 and 8.3.

## **8.5 Discussion and Summary**

This chapter explores the opinions of the three groups of participants about CLT. It also analyzes the intergroup attitudinal (dis)similarities. Presented as follows is a summary of the major findings as well as the discussions thereof.

With regard to the merits of CLT vis-à-vis the traditional teacher-centered pedagogical approach in China, most of the participants regarded the former as the representative of a sophisticated or advanced education philosophy. Major reasons provided are aligned with the popular discourse in ELT that Inner Circle countries cultivate a democratic sociopolitical context and/or a sociocultural milieu advocating individualism and a pioneering spirit, from which CLT sprouts and grows. Meanwhile, CLT was considered conducive for achieving optimal teaching effects, such as establishing a democratic and equitable student-teacher relationship, stimulating students' learning interests, liberating their mind and improving their practical ability to use English. The dominant reason for achieving these teaching effects was claimed to reside mainly in the learner-centered principle advocated by CLT. By contrast, the traditional teacher-centered

approach in China was denigrated, both explicitly and implicitly, as being backward, ossified and destitute of creativity. It was also found that the teachers and administrators were more positive toward CLT than the student group. Notably, a certain number of students and teachers displayed a “Not sure” stance.

As for the application of CLT to classroom teaching, most of the students expressed a strong desire for their teacher to follow CLT, in particular the mixed approach that relies mainly on CLT but takes the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach as a supplement. Major reasons they expressed resonate with the traditional rhetoric that CLT represents an advanced education philosophy and is conducive for generating optimal teaching effects. The inclusion of the teacher-centered approach as a minor supplement was considered facilitative for the reciprocal complement of these two types of teaching approaches. However, this practice was claimed to serve as a buffer for learners before the thorough application of CLT to classroom instruction. The other two participant groups expressed similar opinions. Moreover, many teachers ascribed the obstacles for the complete application of CLT to the examination system in China and the passivity of Chinese students. In addition to the educational culture of China, the administrators referred to the conservative mentality and professional incompetence of Chinese EFL teachers. Despite the differences in reason, the three stakeholder groups as a whole upheld the shift from the teacher-centered approach to CLT as the ultimate objective.

Regarding whether the promotion of CLT entails a type of discrimination against or an oppression over the traditional education culture of China, almost all the students and the majority of teachers and administrators provided negative answers. They asserted that CLT is worth promoting due to its superiority in philosophical foundation and teaching effect as well as the facilitative role it plays in improving the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach and by extension the traditional education culture of China.

Observed from the above-stated findings, most of the participants upheld CLT as a teaching approach superior to the traditional teacher-centered pedagogical approach. When justifying their stance, they often resorted to the learner-centered tenet advocated by CLT. In doing so, they might have failed to realize that CLT may not grant a true

central position to students in the process of classroom instruction. This can be interpreted in part from the perspective of “culture of learning” (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989), which, as part of a macro educational discourse system, “frames what teachers and students expect to happen in classrooms and how participants interpret the format of classroom instruction” (Jin & Cortazzi, 2006, p. 9). Since different countries or societies have their own education culture and therefore different cultures of learning, the application of CLT to classroom instruction for students in a country or society with a teacher-centered pedagogical tradition may not fit in with the local context. In this sense, the promotion of this teaching approach in that country or society can be regarded as an agenda aimed at correcting the habitual learning behaviors of the students, rather than placing them in a respectable center of learning. Meanwhile, CLT, according to Holliday (2005, 2006), does not detach itself from the teacher-centered format typical of audiolingual classrooms, as it is also preoccupied with eliciting and managing student talk during classroom instruction in the name of improving students’ communicative competence in English. The only difference between them lies in that audiolingual classrooms have a clear hierarchical structure whereas CLT exercises control over students in a subtle form (ibid., p. 51) or under the guise of a seemingly democratic and humanistic teaching atmosphere. As a corollary, learners may not be able to realize that they are actually receiving corrective trainings in the name of learner-centeredness or learner autonomy.

CLT is output oriented and it usually makes or even forces students engaged in a large amount of L2 input and output (see Holliday, 2005; Littlewood, 2014). It is true that such practice is conducive for enhancing students’ communicative competence or their practical ability to use English in real life contexts. However, in achieving this teaching or learning effect, CLT marginalizes the linguacultural norms of Outer and Expanding Circle countries. This is because communicative competence in ELT, as a rule, refers to learners’ capability of “being sensitive to the state of mind of individuals and groups within the target language community ... ” (Sterns, 1992, as cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, p. 543) and of following the linguacultural norms of NSs in that society (e.g., Cook, 1999; Hymes, 1972; Leung, 2005). In other words, it advocates that learners must abide by NS linguistic and sociocultural norms in using English, denigrating the NNS counterparts implicitly as being unauthentic, incorrect, erroneous and therefore undesirable. In this logic, CLT should be regarded as a discourse of differentiation or

stratification, producing inevitably ideological and structural inequalities. Ideologically, it serves to reproduce the superior status granted to Inner Circle linguacultural norms and reinforce the conventional construct about the ownership of English. Structurally, it promotes the sales of English language learning and teaching materials and teacher education programs developed by Inner Circle countries in reference to NS linguacultural norms. In the meantime, it opens up more employment opportunities for NESTs in global ELT (Phillipson, 1992, pp. 192-193). These are what most of the participants did not realize when expressing support of CLT in respect of improving students' communicative competence in English.

The strong endorsement for CLT as an ideal teaching approach also corroborates the prevalent belief that it is the best teaching approach and therefore entails benefits for the development of the traditional education culture of Outer and Expanding Circle countries, specifically, that of China in this study (e.g., Liao, 2004). The prevalence of this viewpoint is proof of Inner Circle scholastic hegemony or self-discrimination on the part of NNEs (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, 2012, 2016). Since knowledge is political and usually articulated in the interests of unequal power relations (Pennycook, 1998, pp. 589-590), CLT, a teaching approach stemming from Inner Circle applied linguistics and ELT communities, inevitably represents the worldview of Inner Circle academia and their vested interests. More importantly, it cannot be exempted from the deeply-entrenched colonial ideology in Inner Circle countries because colonialism “produced the initial conditions for the spread of English ... [and] many of the ways of thinking and behaving that are still part of Western cultures” (Pennycook, 1998, p. 19). The promotion of CLT should therefore be seen as a process and product of colonialism, valorizing the knowledge of the Center while denigrating the episteme of the Periphery (e.g., Holliday, 2005; Phan, 2008). Underneath this epistemic dichotomization reverberates the myth of Robinson Crusoe's ‘civilizing’ Man Friday (Pennycook, 1998, pp. 10-16), according to which the Centre is claimed to have the capability to “bring a superior culture of teaching and learning to students and colleagues [in the Periphery] who are perceived not to be able to succeed on their own” (Holliday, 2006, p. 386). Following this line of thought, CLT should not be seen simply as an instructional strategy, but as a discourse of cultural discrimination or epistemological prejudice. The failure to perceive the colonialist essence of CLT may contribute to the continuous conformity in Outer and Expanding Circle countries to the scholarship rooted in the

colonial ideology in Inner Circle countries, with its hegemonic status further enhanced and reinforced in global ELT (e.g., Bax, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2016; Liu, 1998).

Following these discussions, it can be concluded that the three participant groups as a whole bought into the Native-speakerist ideology that valorizes Inner Circle teaching approaches as the representative of modernity whereas disparaging those of Outer and Expanding Circle countries as the symbol of backwardness (e.g., Kubota, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2003b).

As with the support of NESTs, NS English and NS culture, the ideology in support of CLT as being advanced among the three participant groups can be ascribed to the unequal historical-present power relations between the Center and the Periphery. This is because power “produces realities ...domains of objects and rituals of truth” (Foucault, 1977, p. 194) and generates consent to the hegemony of the dominant among the dominated (Gramsci, 1971). Meanwhile, power operates within historical contexts, which determines both the discursive and ideological formations (Fairclough, 1992, p. 55-58; see also Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). Precisely, the strong support of CLT as a superior teaching approach should be traced to the colonial Self versus Other ideology that eulogizes the social and educational culture of Inner Circle countries, which is upheld as a tool to rectify the passivity of the students of Eastern Asian countries (see Pennycook, 2007). The rise of the United States after World War II further enacts this seemingly altruist ideology. As stated previously (see Section 1.4), ELT, as an instrument to learn from the West, set its root in China after its defeats in the two Opium Wars around the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and has gained further momentum since it adopted the Open and Reform policy in 1978. In this macro historical-political context, it is natural to produce in China a prevalent ideology in support of Inner Circle social and educational culture as being modern or advanced. This in turn leads to legitimizing therefore cultural products, particularly the academic works from the Inner Circle applied linguistics and ELT communities, with their proposed teaching approaches accepted as being sophisticated or modern. For example, the identification with the Western nation-state-language episteme (e.g., Anderson, 2006; Wright, 2004) among most of the participants (see Section 6.2) corroborates the endorsement for Inner Circle teaching approaches, as it fosters a notion that English belongs to NSs, who are therefore believed to know better how to teach their own language (e.g., Widdowson,

1994). Following these lines of thought, it is the historical-present power disparity between Inner Circle countries and China that results in the ideology in support of CLT as being superior and as the reference for EFL education in China, with no discrimination generated against the traditional education culture of China (e.g., Chen, 2011; Jin & Cortazzi, 2002; Pan, 2015; Wang, 2011).

The promotion of Inner Circle instructional approaches, particularly CLT, at the government and educational sectors in China can be seen as another factor contributing to the formation of the mentality in support of teaching methodology among the three stakeholder groups. This practice represents the consent of China to Inner Circle cultural hegemony, particularly to the existing order of discourse in ELT “because it is presented ... as being universally beneficial and commonsensical” (Mayr, 2008, p. 14). At the same time, it represents the power effects of the state and its institutions on the ideological formation of their subordinates, the stakeholders engaged in everyday ELT practice. As stated in Section 1.4, the Chinese MOE started to promote CLT in the 1980s, declaring that this teaching approach is conducive for enhancing students’ communicative competence in English to meet the requirements of ever-increasing international communications brought about by the adoption of the Open and Reform policy in China since the late 1970s (e.g., Chen, 2011; Rao, 2013). The acceleration of globalization since 2000 has made the Chinese MOE attach more attention to cultivating students’ practical capability to use English “so that students can communicate effectively in English in their future study, work and social interactions” (MOE, 2007, p. 2, my translation). Accordingly, the requirement for implementing CLT in classroom teaching is raised explicitly in national English curriculum syllabi. For instance, College English Teaching Guideline (2017) provides that CE instruction should follow communication-oriented, task-based, project-based, collaborative and exploratory approaches. Out of the highly centralized political system in China, these policies are implemented in classroom teaching (e.g., Pan, 2015; Yu, 2001). As such, the “bureaucratic-administrative discourses” (Fairclough, 1992) and the related ideology in praise of CLT as the best teaching approach in China (e.g., Liao, 2004) are constantly reproduced among Chinese ELT stakeholders.

Teacher education programs organized by governmental organizations in China also

contributes to the endorsement for Inner Circle teaching approaches, particularly CLT, among the participants, because the education programs usually have “a considerable, if variable, impact on the teachers’ beliefs” (Borg, 2011, p. 370) and by extension their ideological positioning. In the past two or three decades, the Chinese MOE as well as the local education authorities have constantly sent Chinese EFL teachers and EFL program administrators to Inner Circle countries to study TESOL. Despite the merits of this practice, it subscribes to Native-speakerism, as it is premised on the belief that Inner Circle teaching methodology is advanced and that “what the Self offers is good and what is good for the Self is definitely good for the other” (Phan, 2008, p. 87). It seems that the education authorities in China fail to see that TESOL programs offered by most Inner Circle universities are ethnocentric, partly because they are constructed in line with SLA and ELT research conducted in Inner Circle contexts and bear little relevance to ELT in Outer and Expanding Circle countries (Liu, 1998; McKay, 2003b). Added to the reproduction of Native-speakerism among Chinese ELT stakeholders are local teacher and administrator education programs that propagate Inner Circle teaching approaches.

Since teachers and administrators are directly engaged in these education programs, it is likely that they are influenced more deeply by the ideology in support of CLT than their students. This may account for, at least in part, why the teachers and administrators in this study granted more merits to CLT than the students (see Section 8.2). Meanwhile, the continuous operation of these education programs in China may help to explain why CLT has succeeded in dominating the mind of most participants in this study, in contrast to the criticisms and/or resistance from Chinese students and teachers displayed in relevant empirical studies conducted years ago (see Section 2.2.1).

Despite the predominant endorsement for CLT, it was found that many participants expressed an expectation to supplement it with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China (see Section 8.3). This is more pronounced among the teachers and administrators. One possible reason lies in that they are more concerned about the actual teaching effects and reflect more on practicality to do with the application of CLT. Notwithstanding that, most of these participants anticipated the full implementation of CLT in classroom teaching in the future. Arguably, this finding also helps to explain why an unneglectable percentage of the students and teachers chose the “Not sure”



answer to the Likert scale questions regarding whether CLT is superior to the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China in respect of philosophical foundation and teaching effects (see Section 8.2). That more student participants in percentage than teachers selected this answer may rest with the limitation of their knowledge, choosing therefore the middle point answer (Chan, 2017; Stening & Everett, 1984). All these possible interpretations need to be validated by future studies.

This chapter reveals a strong pro-nativeness mentality prevailed among the three groups of stakeholder, who, as a whole, maintained that CLT is superior in theory, valuable for classroom teaching and ideologically free. The construction of this mentality can be ascribed to the historical-present unequal relations between China and Inner Circle countries, the academic discourse of Inner Circle ELT communities, the pro-nativeness propensity of the national EFL education policies and teacher/administrator education practices in China. By contrast, only a small proportion of the participants displayed opposition. Although most of the participants expressed preferences for adopting the traditional teacher-centered approach as a supplement to CLT in classroom teaching, they considered it an expedient strategy or even a helpless choice before the complete application of this teaching approach to classroom instruction in the future. Observed from these findings, it can be concluded that EFL education in China is still dominated by Native-speakerism in respect of teaching methodology.

## Chapter 9 Conclusion

### 9.1 Introduction

In light of the current discursive and ideological struggles against Native-speakerism in global ELT as well as the pro-nativeness tradition in China's EFL education, this study adopts CDA, particularly its DHA approach as a guideline to explore whether – if so, to what extent – the practice of ELT in China is still affected by this chauvinistic ideology. In doing so, it investigates, by means of questionnaire survey and interview, the perceptions of three groups of Chinese ELT stakeholders – students, teachers and administrators – on four interrelated thematic respects of ELT to do with English language teachers, English language varieties, cultural orientations and teaching approaches respectively. Their perceptions are viewed in reference to the dynamics of discourse, ideology and power against the sociocultural and historical-political context of China interweaved with the historical-present Sino-Western relations, therefore unveiling the power relations that underpin the ideological tendencies concerning Native-speakerism among the three stakeholder groups. Findings illuminate that the three participant groups as whole bought into Native-speakerism. This in turn suggests ELT in China is still affected seriously by this chauvinistic ideology.

The study is concluded in this chapter, which comprises six sections. Following the brief review of research background, objective, focus, theoretical approach and methodology (Section 9.1), Section 9.2 summarizes the major findings pertinent to the four sets of research questions (see Section 1.3) as well as the insights acquired through concomitant reflections on these results. This is followed by the discussions about the theoretical and methodological contributions of this study to existing literature (Section 9.3). Section 9.4 discusses the implications of the findings for EFL education in China, focusing on how to adjust the traditional practices in different sectors of this educational arena for the sake of offsetting Native-speakerism. Section 9.5 points out the limitations of this study and implications for relevant future research. This chapter concludes in Section 9.6 with a restatement about the tenacity of Native-speakerism in ELT as well as a call for further research on this topic.

## 9.2 Major findings

This section summarizes and discusses the major findings of this study in relation to the five research questions. The findings are indicative of the attitudinal tendency of the three groups of Chinese ELT stakeholders toward Native-speakerism and by extent the effects of this chauvinistic ideology on EFL education in China.

The answers provided by the three participant groups to the question on the NESTs versus NNESTs issue reveals the vibrancy of the conventional pro-nativeness ideology in praise of Inner Circle NESTs, particularly Anglo-American Caucasians, as the ideal teacher.

Precisely, most of the participants considered NESTs professionally more competent than NNESTs, Chinese EFL teachers in particular. This attitudinal tendency seemed to be more evident among the teachers and administrators. Major reasons expressed by them resonate with the conventional Native-speakerist ideology that NESTs are the proprietors of the English language (e.g., Widdowson, 1994) as well as the established belief in support of Inner Circle education culture as being superior to those of Outer and Expanding Circle countries (e.g., Holliday, 2005). These reasons were also stated by most of the participants in justifying their expectations for hiring NESTs to teach English in China, particularly those from Britain or America with certain academic qualifications and work experiences related to ELT. Different from the administrators, most of the students and teachers did not take race as a gate-keeping criterion. As regards the ideal teacher with whom to learn English, the three participant groups as a whole, however, expressed an explicit support of White Anglo-American NESTs. Moreover, most of the students and teachers upheld the practice of offering higher payment and greater respect to NESTs at workplaces not as a prejudice against local Chinese EFL teachers but a sign of hospitality toward NESTs or a sign of respect for their professional competence. Of the administrators, the majority considered the difference in payment between these two types of teachers not serious and therefore acceptable. Although deeming it discriminatory to grant more respects to NESTs, half of the administrators maintained that it should be tolerated for the development of their EFL programs.

Findings on the perceptions of different English language varieties are suggestive of an overall identification of the three participant groups with the Native-speakerist ideology that valorizes Inner Circle English as the ideal while denigrating Outer and Expanding English varieties as local dialects.

With regard to the relative status of different English language varieties, most of the participants granted honors to Inner Circle English, claiming that it is (more) standard due to its conformity to NS grammar, (more) authentic owing to its historical trajectory, and (more) intelligible because it is unaccented or bears no particular local accents. No significant difference was found between the student group and that of the teachers. By contrast, the statistics suggest that the administrator group seemed to be more positive about Inner Circle English. The belief in the superiority of Inner Circle English was also adopted as the rationale for endorsing it as the learning/teaching target and reference model among the vast majority of the students and teachers. Although most of the administrators raised no explicit requirements for their fellow teachers and students to adhere to NS English norms, they upheld it as the ultimate learning/teaching target. In the same vein, most of the participants developed no awareness of the explicit and implicit discrimination against Outer and Expanding Circle English engendered by the prioritization of Inner Circle English in ELT. Although a certain number of the teachers and administrators acknowledged the linguistic inequality generated by this pro-nativeness practice, they deemed it irresistible owing to the historical-present hegemony of Inner Circle countries.

The viewpoints expressed by the three participant groups on cultural orientations of ELT indicate that the most of them bought into a Native-speakerist ideology in support of Inner Circle culture as the point of reference and target in learning/teaching English.

To be specific, most participants regarded Inner Circle culture as the bedrock of the English language and the overarching reference in learning English. Major reasons articulated by them resonate with the conventional anthropological episteme about the inseparability of language and culture (e.g., Brown, 1994, 2007), the sociopolitical ideology of the nation-language-culture trinity (e.g., Anderson, 2006) and the classic purport in SLA that advocates ESL/EFL learners to acculturate to Inner Circle cultural context (e.g., Schumann, 1986). No significant difference in opinion was found

between the students and the teachers, though the administrator group seemed to be more convinced about the affinity between the English language and Inner Circle culture. Most of the participants also resorted to these viewpoints in justifying their support of Inner Circle culture as the learning target. In particular, they expected EFL textbooks to concentrate on Inner Circle culture, with a small amount of culture of other countries, *inter alia* Chinese culture, as a supplement, claiming that such textbooks are helpful for students to acquire different cultures as well as the English language. Meanwhile, a certain percent of the participants justified the inclusion of a small amount of Chinese culture from a nationalist perspective. Furthermore, most of the students and administrators contended that the emphasis on learning/teaching Inner Circle culture in ELT entails no threat to or no oppression over the development of Chinese culture. Of those students, the majority asserted that Inner Circle culture can provide nutrients for Chinese culture; most of those administrators argued for the immunity of Chinese culture to the side effects of exterior cultures due to the pervasiveness of Chinese culture and the widespread patriotism education in China. A state of “schizophrenia” (Jenkins, 2007) seemed to exist among many teachers. Although acknowledging it as a threat to Chinese culture, they granted endorsement for adhering to Inner Circle cultural norms in EFL education.

The opinions stated by most of the participants regarding the issue of CLT versus the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach are aligned with the Native-speakerist ideology that idealizes Inner Circle teaching approaches.

As for the merits of CLT vis-à-vis the teacher-centered pedagogical approach, most of the participants regarded CLT as the representative of a sophisticated or an advanced education philosophy for reasons that it is rooted in the democratic and pioneering sociopolitical and sociocultural context of Inner Circle countries. It was also considered capable of achieving optimal teaching effects due to its learner-centered principle, such as cultivating a democratic student-teacher relationship, stimulating students’ learning interests, liberating their mind and improving their practical ability to use English in real life situations. By contrast, the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach was denigrated as being backward and destitute of creativity. Relevant statistics seems to show that the teachers and administrators were more positive about CLT than the students group. Most participants also articulated these viewpoints when defending

their preference for the application of CLT to classroom teaching. Although expecting to adopt the teacher-centered approach as a supplement to CLT, they regarded the complete shift to CLT as the ultimate goal. Notwithstanding the predominant support of CLT, the traditional teacher-centered approach also collected endorsement from a certain percent of the participants, particularly students. In addition, the three groups as a whole maintained that the promotion of CLT entails no discrimination against or oppression over the traditional education culture of China, claiming that CLT deserves the promotion for its merits in respect of philosophical foundation and teaching effect.

The above-stated findings in relation to the research questions illuminate that the three groups of participants as an entirety granted a prestigious status to Inner Circle NS products in respect of teacher, language, culture and teaching methodology rather than to their NNS counterparts that emanate from Outer and Expanding Circle countries. In light of the alignment between this ideological positioning with the conventional Self versus Other ideology in ELT, it can be said that most of the participants in this study bought into Native-speakerism. Since they are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice, their viewpoints are inevitably constrained and/or constructed to a great degree by the institutional ideology, therefore representing the overall ideological propensity of EFL education in China. As such, it can be concluded that EFL education in China is still seriously affected by Native-speakerism.

In comparison with the pro-nativeness attitude expressed by the vast majority of the participants in this study, what is more significant is that they were unaware that it is the (neo)colonial heritage, the cultural chauvinism and/or the (neo)racist ideology that sustains the nativeness versus non-nativeness dichotomy. In particular, they seemed to be unaware or refuse to accept the following critical voices and related realities to do with the four respects of ELT.

Firstly, NS is a mythical construct, more sociocultural and sociopolitical than linguistic (e.g., Davies, 1991, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Inbar-Lourie, 2005; Rampton, 1990) and that being a NS does not makes a person a qualified teacher automatically, as teachers are made rather than born (e.g., Astor, 2000; Braine, 2010; Canagarajah, 1999a). Secondly, English has become glocalised and all English language varieties are at an equal foot English (e.g., Jenkins, 2015; Matsuda, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2011). In

particular, the notion in praise of Inner Circle English as being standard and authentic is a sociopolitical construct rather than a representation of linguistic reality; intelligibility requires the joint efforts of the parties engaged in actual communications instead of one-way accommodation of NNSs to their NS interlocutor(s) (e.g., McKay & Bokhorst-Heng, 2008; Smith & Nelson, 1985). Thirdly, English can be used by anyone as a means to express his/her own culture in the current world (Smith, 1987, as cited in Alptekin, 1993, p. 140), where most communications in English are conducted between or among NNSs with no relevance to Inner Circle cultural norms (e.g., Cogo, 2012; Graddol, 2006; McKay, 2002). More importantly, as with the endorsement for Inner Circle English, the endorsement for Inner Circle culture in ELT reproduces the conventional sociopolitical nation-language-culture episteme (e.g., Anderson, 2006; Bonfiglio, 2013) in contrast to the current translingual and transcultural social reality. Fourthly, CLT is not applicable anywhere, as education or teaching is situated and the application of teaching approaches or methods must take into account the particularity of local settings (e.g., Bax, 2003; Kramsch & Sullivan, 1996; Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, 2006). Furthermore, the promotion of Inner Circle teaching approaches in global ELT entails the imposition of corrective trainings on NNESTs and NNS students, denying their education tradition and hindering the professional development of NNESTs (e.g., Holliday, 2005, 2006; McKay, 2003b). Finally, all these cognitive fallacies result in their unawareness of the colonial agenda and the culturist incentive embedded in the pro-nativeness constructs and practices that are still prevalent in ELT.

Perhaps the most significant finding, more inferred than directly observed, is that the sociocultural and historical-political context surrounding EFL education in China provides the condition for the reproduction of Native-speakerism among the three participant groups. One significant reason is that the formation, maintenance and/or transformation of ideology depend(s) on social structure, particularly the power dynamics therein (van Dijk, 2008, p. 90), as power “produces realities ...domains of objects and rituals of truth” (Foucault, 1977, p. 194) and ensures “[certain] orders of discourse are ideologically harmonized internally” (Fairclough, 1989, p. 30). Meanwhile, any ideology and its concomitant discourse have a historical trajectory, synchronized with the power struggles between the dominant and the dominated (e.g., van Dijk, 2001a; Wodak & Reisigl, 2001). Of the contextual factors related to this study, two interconnected variables – the historical-present relations between China and the

English speaking West and the top-down governmentality of ELT practices through ELT policies and regulations in China – should be most resorted to in elucidating why most of the participants fell into the ideological loop of Native-speakerism. This is because these two factors represent two strands of power, which generate and sustain to a large extent the mentality of those ELT stakeholders.

As stated earlier (see Section 1.4), the state-run foreign language education in China was initiated in the 1860s after China's defeats in the wars with Western powers, with the intention to learn modern science and technology from the West. Ever since the ensuing defeat in the first Sino-Japanese War in 1894, to learn from the West had become a mainstream ideology, governing the life and production in most social sectors in China. This instrumental ideology in foreign language education, particularly in ELT has been further strengthened since China adopted the Open and Reform policy for its economic construction in 1978. Underlying this instrumental rationality is an explicit discursive/ideological regime in praise of the West, particularly Inner Circle countries, as being superior to China. Since education is socially situated, ELT practice in China is inevitably dominated by this discursive/ideological regime, with other ideologies and their concomitant discourses devoiced or otherized. As a corollary, this regime finds its massive reproduction among those who are involved in everyday education because they are provided no (easy) access to “the knowledge or beliefs needed to challenge the discourse or information they are exposed to” (Wodak, 1987, as cited in van Dijk, 2008, p. 92). This is why most of the participants in this study upheld Inner Circle NS products – teacher, language, culture, and teaching approach – as the ideal. For instance, many participants in this study adopted the “learning from the better” logic to justify that the promotion of CLT entails no discrimination against or oppression over the traditional education culture of China (see Section 8.4), without realizing that CLT represents a colonial Self versus Other politics (Holliday, 2005, 2006; Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, 2016).

The top-down governmentality of a society through power helps to “shape, sculpt, mobilize, and work through the choices, desires, aspirations, needs, wants, and lifestyles of certain individuals and groups” (Dean, 1999, as cited in Aneja, 2016, p. 360). This is also true of the governmentality of ELT practices by means of policies and regulations in China. As stated previously (see Section 1.4), the national ELT syllabi or



EFL course requirements for students at different educational or school sectors in China usually stipulate that EFL education should follow Inner Circle linguacultural norms and teaching methodologies; government policies in relation to hiring foreign English language teachers grant priority to NESTs from Inner Circle countries. Due to the highly centralized political system in China, ELT stakeholders may feel obliged to abide by these syllabi. In the meantime, these syllabi tend to be accepted voluntarily by those engaged in everyday ELT practice, since they are issued by governmental institutions and bear the expert voices. Part of the reason lies in that the dominant “tend to accept the beliefs, knowledge and opinions through discourses from what they see as authoritative, trustworthy or credible sources” (see van Dijk, 2003, p. 92), including governmental institutions and experts. As a corollary, these Inner Circle NS products are further constructed discursively and ideologically as being authoritative by those who are engaged in everyday ELT practice, particularly teachers, students and administrators.

Following the discussions about these contextual variables, it can be concluded that the pro-nativeness mentality among most of the participants in this study are born out of a three-dimensional structural mechanism, corroborating the CDA framework proposed Fairclough (1995, p. 98) and the DHA conceptual model (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 93). Inside the mechanism, the three ELT stakeholder bodies are placed at the bottom, the education management, particularly ELT policy or regulation makers in the middle, and the historical-present relations between China and the English speaking West at the top. The attitudes of the stakeholders are mainly determined by the structural power in this mechanism. Meanwhile, their consent to the Native-speakerist episteme in turn reproduces and reinforces the hegemonic status of Native-speakerism in ELT. In this sense, this finding further prove the dynamics of power and knowledge. In the words of Foucault (1977), “there is no power relations without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (p.27). Although displaying mainly the productiveness of power, this study does not deny totally the agency of the stakeholders, as voices in opposition to Native-speakerism, such as the proposal for teaching China English (see Section 6.3), are also heard among the participants, despite they are low in volume. In addition, a certain percent of students and teachers displayed a “Not sure” stance on the nativeness versus non-nativeness statements during the questionnaire survey. This may

represent a “lack of critical awareness” or a “judicial attitude” produced out of the power struggles in ELT. However, it warrants further exploration.

Observed from the findings presented and discussed above, it is evident that the three participant groups as a whole bought into Native-speakerism due to the influence of contextual factors, particularly the historical-present unequal relations between China and the English speaking West as well as the pro-nativeness ELT policies or regulations in China. In addition to the findings shared with most of the attitudinal studies reviewed previously (see Section 2.2.1), two discrepant results are observable. One consists in the denial of the pedagogical skills of Chinese EFL teachers, which, however, were claimed to be the strength of NNESTs in many previous studies (e.g., Cheung & Braine, 2007; Ma, 2012; Medgyes, 1994, 2001). The other refers to the controversy surrounding CLT. In this study, most of the participants granted endorsement for CLT, which, however, encountered strong oppositions to its application to classroom teaching on the part the students and teachers in many previous studies, including those focusing on EFL education in China (e.g., Li, 2004; Rao, 2002). Both findings can be attributed to the pro-nativeness tradition in China. In particular, the enthusiastic promotion of CLT by the educational management in China during the past three decades or so may be accountable for the difference between the predominant expectation of the stakeholders for the application of CLT to classroom instruction in this study and the strong opposition to it in studies that were conducted about ten years ago. Despite these interpretations, the differences in finding warrant further explorations.

### **9.3 Contributions**

Several contributions of this study to the existing literature can be observed. Broadly speaking, they fall into two categories. One lies in its methodological design while the other rests with its enriching the theory of Native-speakerism.

Methodologically, this study is, to my knowledge, the first endeavor to conduct a comprehensive study on Native-speakerism in ELT. This is evident in its expanded scope in respect of participant category and research content. As discussed previously (see Section 2.2.2), most previous attitudinal studies take one or two type(s) of ELT

stakeholders as research participants without incorporating in a single study the three categories of stakeholders – teachers, students and administrators – who are directly engaged in everyday ELT practice. Meanwhile, those studies focused on the attitudes of ELT stakeholders toward Native-speakerism in one or two respect(s) of ELT; none of them has explored simultaneously this chauvinistic ideology in the four interrelated thematic respects to do with teachers, English language varieties, cultural orientations and teaching approaches. This study therefore transcends these two limitations by incorporating teachers, students and administrators as participants and by investigating their attitudes toward Native-speakerism in the four thematic respects. In this sense, it sets up an example for conducting a comprehensive study on Native-speakerism and its related issues in ELT.

This study also constitutes a relatively innovative attempt to investigate the attitudes of ELT stakeholders toward Native-speakerism by making use of the advantages of both attitudinal studies and critical studies, particularly those that adopt CDA approach. As noted earlier (see Section 2.2), attitudinal studies tend to adopt questionnaires, often coupled with interviews, as a research instrument and therefore are liable to survey the attitudes of a large population and guarantee the abundance and richness of the data. This is what the traditional CDA studies are destitute of, with “short fragments of data” (Stubbs, 1997, p. 7) usually “presented as representative” (e.g., Breeze, 2011, p. 504) and with subjective interpretations of the data conducted by researchers in accordance with their priori ideological convictions (e.g., Schegloff, 1997; Slembrouck, 2001; Widdowson, 1998b). Meanwhile, attitudinal studies are aimed at finding out the general attitudinal tendency regarding the issue(s) in question among the sampled population whereas CDA studies, albeit the traditional data problem, view the issue(s) from the perspective of the dynamics of discourse, ideology and power, and thereby are helpful for unveiling what underlies the attitudes. In this sense, the combination of these two categories of research parameters is conducive for exposing the attitudinal tendency of the stakeholders in relation to Native-speakerism and unveiling the power relations and the ideological foundation that sustain their expressed attitude(s).

Furthermore, although the triangulatory approach advocated by DHA helps to expand the data size and minimize the priori bias in data interpretation, most DHA studies, as with CDA studies conducted earlier (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough,

1993), tend to draw on qualitative data. The incorporation of both the qualitative and quantitative data in this study fills this methodological gap and enrich in a sense the DHA methodology.

Theoretically, this study transcends the semantic scope of the Hollidayian Native-speakerism (2005, 2006) in that it is not confined to regarding merely the idealization of NESTs as Native-speakerism. Rather, it is defined as the pro-nativeness ideology in every aspect of ELT, particularly in the four dimensions of everyday ELT practice. In this sense, the three traditional conceptions about the ownership of the English language (e.g., Widdowson, 1994), the brilliance of Inner Circle culture (e.g., Tomlinson, 1991) and the superiority of teaching approaches/methods from the English speaking West (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2008) should not be regarded solely as the bedrocks of the idealization of NESTs. Rather, the pro-nativeness ideology in relation to each of these three constructs can serve as an independent research focus paralleling that on the NESTs versus NNESTs dichotomy – albeit the inseparability of these four dimensions – or as one of the foci in a comprehensive study on Native-speakerism.

In addition, the overall finding of this study confirms the purports of CDA on hegemony. Specifically, the pro-nativeness mentality that prevailed across the three groups of participants is corroborative of the thesis that most subordinates tend to be unaware of their true interests and the power they subject to, or lack specific knowledge to resist top-down manipulation (e.g., Fairclough, 1989; Flowerdew, 1997; van Dijk, 2006). It also lends support to the scholarly stance that the relics of colonialism is not confined to ELT in former colonies of the British Empire (e.g., Shin, 2006, p. 147). Rather, the global ELT is a colonial product or construct (e.g., Pennycook, 1998).

#### **9.4 Suggestions for EFL education**

In addition to the contributions stated in the above section, this study, particularly its findings, has some implications for intervening in Native-speakerism in China's EFL education as well as in the ELT realm of other countries with a sociocultural and historical-political context similar to that of China.

In order to offset Native-speakerism, those that are engaged in EFL education in China, such as policy makers, researchers, teacher educators, program administrators, teachers and students, need to develop an awareness of the linguistic and cultural politics in ELT through self-reflection and then “redefine the need and goals for English language education” (Pan, 2015, p. 165). In particular, they need to perceive that the conformity to Native-speakerism entails or generates discrimination against local Chinese EFL teachers, an oppression over Outer and Expanding Circle English, a threat to the development of Chinese culture and a hegemony over the traditional education culture of China. More importantly, they need to understand that the adherence to the nativeness principle in mind and in action among ELT stakeholders in Outer and Expanding Circle countries means self-marginalization, which contributes conversely to reinforcing the hegemonic status of the political, economic, cultural and academic culture of Inner Circle countries (e.g., Kumaravadivelu, 2016).

Nevertheless, the stakeholders themselves may not be able to reflect on the chauvinistic essence of Native-speakerism and then take intervening actions. Their self-reflection usually requires a catalyst, i.e., inspirations from the critical scholarship regarding Native-speakerism, particularly the studies on the (post-)colonial politics in ELT (e.g., Pennycook, 1994, 1998; Phillipson, 1992), the NESTs versus NNESTs issue (e.g., Braine, 2010; Mahboob, 2010) and the glocalization of the English language (e.g., Jenkins, 2007; Kirkpatrick, 2010; Seidlhofer, 2011). Research on Native-speakerism in China’s ELT from a critical lens is of special significance for Chinese ELT stakeholders. Unfortunately, it remains an underexplored terrain (see section 2.2). More efforts are therefore required of scholars engaged in this profession to turn to the cultural politics in ELT from their habitual technical research foci, such as, what teaching methods are effective for acquiring NS languacultural norms.

In addition to absorbing nutrients from the critical scholarship, concrete consciousness-raising actions have to be taken in different sectors of EFL education in order to further foster the critical awareness on the part of ELT stakeholders. Due to the highly centralized political system of China, national EFL policies, inter alia EFL curriculum syllabi, as well as related regulations, such as those on the employment of foreign English language teachers, should be placed at the forefront for reconsideration. Since “language policy is an apparatus for the state’s political and cultural [and ideological]

governance” (Pan, 2015, p. 161), the pro-nativeness ideology embedded in these policies is usually reproduced among those who are involved in everyday ELT practice, as is evidenced by the pervasive mentality in support of the nativeness principle among the three groups of participants in this study. In this logic, policy makers should adjust these policies or syllabi in reference to the objective of establishing a democratic and equitable ELT world. For instance, the requirement for the Inner Circle NS status of potential applicants in national foreign teacher hiring policies, such as the regulation issued by SAOFEA in 2015 (see Section 1.4.3), should be adjusted or removed, as it reproduces neo-racism as well as self-discrimination. The constant execution of this policy will further reinforce the inequality between NESTs and NNESTs in ELT.

In light of the role that teachers play in cultivating students’ worldviews, measures should be taken to help teachers as well as EFL program administrators – who often serve as classroom teachers in addition to conducting administration – to achieve the epistemic break from the conventional Native-speakerist ELT paradigm. Since pre- and in-service teacher education programs are a crucial site in which teacher beliefs are constructed (e.g., Borg, 2011; Woods, 2003), they constitute another sector that needs adjusting. For instance, rather than presenting to teacher trainees Inner Circle teaching methodologies as the pedagogical proper and asking them to follow in their (future) instructional practices, teacher educators should encourage the trainees to “develop the knowledge, skill and disposition necessary to become producers of [the pedagogical knowledge]” (Kumaravadivelu, 2016, p. 81) pursuant to their professional localities. In the meantime, courses or lectures about the glocalization of the English language should be offered in order to foster among them the awareness that all English language varieties are equal and StE is nothing but a mythical construct. Essentially, they should be encouraged to establish professional self-confidence and eradicate the (possible) “imposter syndrome” (Bernat, 2008) deeply entrenched in the mind of many NNESTs.

Due to the contribution of ELT curricula to constructing students’ epistemic system, the traditional pro-nativeness curricular content needs adjusting. For instance, although there is nothing wrong to offer an English language variety that is widely used in the world, such as Anglo-American English, it is necessary to help students to develop the awareness that this pedagogical choice is out of expediency and other English language varieties are also StE. To this end, teachers should provide for students samples of

different English language varieties. The proposal of Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) is highly constructive, i.e., “hiring teachers who have proficiency and experience in different varieties of English” (p. 338). In the meantime, this practice is conducive for offsetting and removing students’ bias against NNESTs. Although it is not appropriate for non-English-major students to read and write a response to critical works, such as Robert Philipson’s *Linguistic Imperialism*, teachers can develop supplementary reading materials that cover some ideas on the politics in ELT or the globalization of the English language and take a lead in the subsequent classroom discussions. Moreover, ELT curricular materials should incorporate cultures of other countries and learners’ own culture, in addition to global and Inner Circle cultures (e.g., Matsuda & Friedrich, 2011; see also McKay, 2002; 2012b). By doing so, students may develop the awareness that English can be used by any person to express his/her own cultural values. More importantly, teachers should help students to perceive that no culture is monolithic, all cultures are equal, and a national culture, like a national language, is a socially constructed myth interconnected with the dynamics of discourse, ideology and power.

## **9.5 Limitations and implications for future research**

Despite the merits of this study, it has a few limitations as well as implications, which, I believe, can provide some inspirations for relevant studies in the future.

One of the limitations lies in the way the attitudinal tendencies among the three participants groups are compared. In this study, the overall ideological tendency of the administrator group is judged according to the statistical percentages representing the administrators in (dis)agreement on Native-speakerism. Nevertheless, the numerical figures are abstracted from the data collected through interviews. Although they can be measured against the statistics procured through the questionnaire surveys of the students and teachers, the comparison would be more accurate and cogent if the data for the administrators had been collected with the same type of research instrument. In the meantime, the sampled administrators are small in number, though this is inevitable in view of the reality that they are much smaller in population than either students or teachers. Future studies should try to incorporate more administrators and investigate their attitudes by means of questionnaire and interview and at the same time select a

certain number of the students and teachers in order to ensure a more accurate and cogent inter-group comparison.

Meanwhile, intergroup (dis)similarities in attitude were located and related discussions were conducted. For instance, more teacher participants in percentage than students were found granting a superior professional status to NESTs as being superior (see Section 5.2) and pre-service educational experience of the teachers was asserted to account for the difference (see Section 5.6). However, there are no hard data to sustain or validate this judgement or inference. Future studies are suggested to explore group specific factors, such as group experience, that are accountable for the group specific attitude toward Native-speakerism. Moreover, the (possible) cross-group influence on the ideological formation was left unexplored. It is unclear whether – if so, how – the ideology of one participant group exerts impacts on that of another group. Given the hierarchical power relations inside educational institutes (e.g., Kincheloe, 2008), inter-group ideological dynamics should serve as a point of focus for future studies.

Another limitation of this study consists in that it did not conduct intra-group analysis. In this study, each participant group is taken as an entirety and intra-group attitudinal (dis)similarities were not conducted. This is a limitation of this study, though it is out of data constraint (see Section 4.7). Future studies need to take into account individual variables, as each participant group is not monolithic or unitary. Factors, *inter alia* educational or life experience, are accountable for the ideological formations of different ELT stakeholders, alongside the macro sociocultural and historical-political structure. One significant reason lies in that a person's opinion on social entities usually "depends on [his/her] early attitudes or ideologies ... as well as [his/her] personal experiences" (van Dijk, 2008, p. 15). Different experiences therefore entail different beliefs, opinions or ideological stances.

To take into account group specific and individual factors can help to fill the theoretical and methodological gap of CDA studies. Many CDA studies, particularly in line with the dialectical-relational approach (Fairclough, 2009) take a synchronic perspective on the relationship between discourse and society, but provide no elaboration on "how text-external data should be incorporated in the analysis" (Scheuer, 2003, p. 144). Although DHA proposes analyzing discourse in reference to its historical source and



trajectory, it does not incorporate personal histories, whose interactions with objective structures usually bring forth “habitus”, a disposition that determines a person’s action and perception of the world in the future (Bourdieu, 1984). Future studies are suggested to take it as a key variable. This methodological consideration is also conducive for enriching research findings, as it helps to disclose further detailed reasons for the stated attitudes. Frequently, the same attitude may come from different reasons. This might be true of the “Not sure” answer chosen by a certain percent of the students and teachers during the questionnaire surveys (see the final sections of Chapters 5-8).

As a senior EFL teacher working at a Chinese university, I have been regarding Native-speakerism as a chauvinistic ideology and upholding the removal of it as my social mission. When conducting the study, I exerted myself to prevent my professional identity and priori conviction about Native-speakerism from affecting the results of this study. As stated in Chapter 4, I tried to create a democratic and equitable atmosphere when collecting data in the pilot and final phases (see Sections 4.4 and 4.5). Meanwhile, I interpreted the qualitative data in line with triangulation in order to avoid potential subjective interpretations (see Section 4.7), a typical problem with many CDA studies (e.g., Schegloff, 1997). Despite these efforts, my professional status and priori belief may have more or less impacts on research findings. In addition, the research focus and objective of CDA – making explicit the hidden ideology and power relations in discourse and providing strategies for solving social problems (e.g., Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) – may lead many researchers, including me to overinterpret power and ideology in data, which can be classified as another kind of subjective interpretation.

Having said that, this study is of great value in terms of its methodological design, theoretical contribution and implications for ELT practice. It can be replicated with those who are involved in China’s EFL education at other educational levels. It can also be taken as a point of reference for future studies in other countries, particularly those with a sociocultural and historical-political context similar to that of China.

## **9.6 Final remarks**

Alongside the accelerated glocalization of the English language and the ever-increasing

attention to the dynamics of discourse, power, and ideology in the field of social and linguistic studies in the past few decades, a plethora of scholarly and institutional efforts have been made to resist or fight Native-speakerism. They have launched a call for the establishment of a critical ELT in line with a democratic and ethical principle. In the words of Modiano (2004),

“A critical ELT supports the belief that the spirit of integration can exist alongside cultural and linguistic diversity. Thus, native and non-native speech communities, their intellectual properties, their historical legacies, and the roles that they play in the world at large are not placed in hierarchies but instead are brought forth as equally relevant” (p. 222)

Nevertheless, this objective has yet to be achieved. This is evident from the persistence and pervasiveness of the pro-nativeness mentality among ELT stakeholders discovered in this study and many others that were conducted in (dis)similar ELT contexts. Inner Circle NS products in respect of teacher, language, culture and teaching methodology are still upheld as the idol or the reference model in global ELT. It is thereby imperative for more researchers in applied linguistics and ELT to carry out the missions as what Gramsci (1971) termed as organic intellectuals. They need to conduct more research on Native-speakerism and formulate effective intervening tactics to help ELT stakeholders, particularly those in Outer and Expanding Circle countries to accomplish the epistemic break from the conventional Native-speakerist ELT paradigm, though many ideological impediments loom ahead.

## REFERENCES

- Adamson, B., & Morris, P. (1997). The English curriculum in the People's Republic of China. *Comparative Education Review*, 41(1), 3-26.
- Adolphs, S. (2005). "I don't think I should learn all this" — a longitudinal view of attitudes towards 'native speaker' English. In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intermann (Eds.), *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom* (pp. 119-131). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes*, 33(2), 195-222.
- Akbari, R. (2008). Postmethod discourse and practice. *TESOL quarterly*, 42(4), 641-652.
- Alptekin, C. (1993). Target-language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal*, 47(2), 136-143.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57-64.
- Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. London: Routledge.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL quarterly*, 31(3), 580-583.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of Nationalism* (Revised ed.). London: Verso.
- Aneja, G. A. (2014). Disinventing and reconstituting native speaker ideologies through the classroom experiences of international TESOL students. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)*, 29(1), 23-39.
- Aneja, G. A. (2016). Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (non) native speaking. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(4), 351-379.
- Apple, M. W., & Christian-Smith, L. K. (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Astor, A. (2000). A qualified nonnative English-speaking teacher is second to none in the field. *TESOL Matters*, 10(2), 18-19.
- Baker, W. (2009). The cultures of English as a lingua franca. *TESOL quarterly*, 43(4), 567-592.
- Baker, W. (2011). From cultural awareness to intercultural awareness: culture in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 62-70.
- Bamgbose, A. (1998). Torn between the norms: Innovations in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 17(1), 1-14.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278-287.
- Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non- native English language teachers' perspective on culture in English as a Foreign Language classrooms. *Teacher Development*, 10(2), 233-247.
- Beckett, G. H., & Stieffvater, A. (2009). Change in ESL graduate students' perspectives on non-native English-speaker teachers. *TESOL Canada Journal*, 27(1), 27-46.
- Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195-215). New York: Springer.
- Berman, R. A. (1994). Global Thinking, Local Teaching: Departments, Curricula, and Culture. *ADFL Bulletin*, 26(1), 7-11.

- Bernat, E. (2008). Towards a pedagogy of empowerment: The case of 'impostor syndrome' among pre-service non-native speaker teachers in TESOL. *English language teacher education and development*, 11(1), 1-8.
- Bhatt, R. M. (2002). Experts, dialects, and discourse. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 74-109.
- Bitchener, J. (2009). *Writing an applied linguistics thesis or dissertation: A guide to presenting empirical research*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bleistein, T. M. (2013). *Chinese Tertiary English Educators' Perceptions of Foreign Teacher Involvement in Their Professional Development*. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation. Biola University. La Mirada, California
- Bley- Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: The case of systematicity. *Language learning*, 33(1), 1-17.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of Anthropology*, 29: 447-466.
- Blum, A., & Johnson, E. J. (2012). Reading repression: Textualizing the linguistic marginalization of nonnative English-speaking teachers in Arizona. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 11(3), 167-184.
- Bolton, K. (2002). Chinese Englishes: from Canton jargon to global English. *World Englishes*, 21(2), 181-199.
- Bolton, K. (2008). English in Asia, Asian Englishes, and the issue of proficiency. *English Today*, 24(2), 3-12.
- Bolton, K., & Graddol, D. (2012). English in China today. *English Today*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Bonfiglio, T. P. (2013). Inventing the native speaker. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(2), 29-58.
- Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 370-380.
- Boukala, S. (2014). Waiting for democracy: Political crisis and the discursive (re) invention of the 'national enemy' in times of 'Grecoversy'. *Discourse & Society*, 25(4), 483-499.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological theory*, 7(1), 14-25.
- Boyle, J. (2000). A brief history of English language teaching in China. *IATEFL Issues*, 155(6), 14-15.
- Braine, G. (2004). The nonnative English-speaking professionals' movement and its research foundations. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 9-24). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Braine, G. (2005). A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 13-23). New York: Springer.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy and professional growth*. New York: Routledge.
- Braine, G. (Ed.) (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Breeze, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics*, 21(4), 493-525.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D. (2009). Open-response items in questionnaires. In J. Heigham & R. A. Croker (Eds.), *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction* (pp. 200-219). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational researcher*, 18(1), 32-42.
- Brutt-Griffler, J., & Samimy, K. K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, 20(1), 99-106.
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? *Qualitative research*, 6(1), 97-113.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Butler, Y. G. (2007). How Are Nonnative- English- Speaking Teachers Perceived by Young Learners? *TESOL quarterly*, 41(4), 731-755.
- Byram, M. (1988). Foreign language education and cultural studies. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 1(1), 15-31.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999a). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999b). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). Reconstructing local knowledge, reconfiguring language studies. In A. S. Canagarajah (Ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice* (pp. 3-24). New York: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2014). In search of a new paradigm for teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Journal*, 5(4), 767-785.
- Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' reinterpretation of a task- based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL quarterly*, 38(4), 639-662.
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2015). A Multi- perspective investigation of attitudes towards English accents in Hong Kong: Implications for pronunciation teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 50(2), 285-313.
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2017). Stakeholders' perceptions of language variation, English language teaching and language use: the case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(1), 2-18.
- Chang, J. (2006). Globalization and English in Chinese higher education. *World Englishes*, 25(3/4), 513-525.
- Chang, M. (2011). EFL teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*, 53, 17-34. Retrieved on January 25th, 2015 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/PTA/Volume-2053-mc.pdf>.
- Chen, X. (2011). *A Study on Vicissitudes of English Education in China*. Hangzhou, China: Zhejiang University Press.
- Cheng, L. (2008). The key to success: English language testing in China. *Language Testing*, 25(1), 15-37.
- Cheng, X. (2000). Asian Students' Reticence Revisited. *System*, 28(3), 435-446.
- Cheng, X. (2002). Chinese EFL students' cultures of learning. In C. Lee & W. Littlewood (Eds.), *Culture, communication and language pedagogy* (pp. 103-116). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Baptist University Press.
- Cheung, Y. L. (2002). *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and non-native teachers of English*. Unpublished Master's thesis. The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

- Cheung, Y. L., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 257-277.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Chinh, N. D. (2013). Cultural diversity in English language teaching: Learners' voices. *English Language Teaching*, 6(4), 1-7. Retrieve on December 15th, 2014 from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1076981.pdf>.
- Choe, H. (2007). Korean EFL teachers' perception of English speakers and varieties. *Foreign Languages Education*, 14(1), 85-107.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*: Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press.
- Chowdhury, R., & Phan, L. H. (2008). Reflecting on Western TESOL training and communicative language teaching: Bangladeshi teachers' voices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(3), 305-316.
- Chung, I., & Huang, Y.-C. (2010). The implementation of communicative language teaching: An investigation of students' viewpoints. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(1), 67-78.
- Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System*, 35(4), 407-430.
- Cogo, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca: Concepts, use, and implications. *ELT Journal*, 66(1), 97-105.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). English teaching and learning in China. *Language Teaching*, 29(2), 61-80.
- Cortezzi, M., & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In H. E (Ed.), *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 196-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cotterall, S. (2000). Promoting learner autonomy through the curriculum: Principles for designing language courses. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 109-117.
- Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 209-240). London: Sage.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(2), 35-52.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: University Press Edinburgh.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Davila, B. (2016). The Inevitability of "Standard" English: Discursive Constructions of Standard Language Ideologies. *Written Communication*, 33(2), 127-148.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80-88.
- Dewey, M. (2015). Time to wake up some dogs! Shifting the culture of language in ELT. In Y. Bayyurt & S. Akcan (Eds.), *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca* (pp. 121-134). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Dewey, M., & Jenkins, J. (2010). English as a lingua franca in the global context: Interconnectedness, variation and change. In M. Saxena (Ed.), *Contending with globalization in World Englishes* (pp. 72-92). Bristol: Multilingual matters.

- Doan, N. B. (2016). To employ or not to employ expatriate non-native speaker teachers: views from within. *Asian Englishes*, 18(1), 67-79.
- Doğançay-Aktuna, S. (2008). Non-native English speaking teacher educators: A profile from Turkey. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & J. Hardman (Eds.), *Global English teaching and teacher education: Praxis and possibility* (pp. 61-82). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Inc.
- Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2014). Language friction and multilingual policies in higher education: the stakeholders' view. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(4), 345-360.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Ed.) (1998). Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, P. (2003). Sociolinguistics and authenticity: An elephant in the room. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 392-431.
- Evans, S. (2006). The Beginnings of English Language Teaching in China. *Asian Englishes*, 9(1), 42-63.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & society*, 4(2), 133-168.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2009). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 162-187). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In V. D. Teun A (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage
- Fang, F. G. (2016). Investigating attitudes towards English accents from an ELF framework. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 68-80.
- Featherstone, M. (1995). *Undoing culture: Globalization, postmodernism and identity*. London: Sage.
- Filep, B. (2009). Interview and translation strategies: coping with multilingual settings and data. *Social Geography*, 4(1), 59-70.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Flowerdew, J. (1997). Reproduction, resistance and joint-production of language power: A Hong Kong case study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27(3), 315-337.
- Fong, E. T. Y. (2009). English in China: some thoughts after the Beijing Olympics. *English Today*, 25(1), 44-49.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punishment: The birth of the prison*. London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M. (1984). *The foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon.
- Frymier, A. B., Shulman, G. M., & Houser, M. (1996). The development of a learner empowerment measure. *Communication Education*, 45(3), 181-199.

- Gaies, S. J., & Beebe, J. D. (1991). *The Matched-Guise Technique for Measuring Attitudes and Their Implications for Language Education: A Critical Assessment*. (ERIC Number: ED367168). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED367168>.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in Second-Language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Ge, C. (1980). Random thoughts on some problems in Chinese-English translation [Mantan you han yi ying wenti]. *Chinese Translators' Journal [Fanyi Tongxun]*, 2, 1-8.
- Graham, P. (2018). Ethics in critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 15(2), 186-203.
- Gong, Y. (2009). Rethinking the ideology of English language education in schools [Chongxin Kaolv Jichu Jiaoyu Yingyu Jiaoxue De Linian]. *Foreign Languages in China [Zhongguo Waiyu]*, 6(6), 9-16.
- Gong, Y., & Holliday, A. (2013). Cultures of change: Appropriate cultural content in Chinese school textbooks. In K. Hyland & L. L. C. Wong (Eds.), *Innovation and Change in English Language Education* (pp. 44-57). New York: Routledge.
- Govardhan, A. K., Nayar, B., & Sheorey, R. (1999). Do US MATESOL Programs Prepare Students to Teach Abroad? *TESOL quarterly*, 33(1), 114-125.
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English? A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. London: The British Council
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. London: The British Council
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci (Edited and translated by Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith)*. London: International Publishers.
- Guo, Y. (2009). Racializing immigrant professionals in an employment preparation ESL program. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, 1(2), 40-54.
- Guo, Y., & Beckett, G. H. (2007). The hegemony of English as a global language: Reclaiming local knowledge and culture in China. *Convergence*, 40(1/2), 117-132.
- Halliday, M. A., & Matthiessen, C. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Hashimoto, K. (2013). The construction of the 'Native Speaker' in Japan's Educational policies for TEFL. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 159-168). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- He, D. (2015). University students' and teachers' perceptions of China English and world Englishes: Language attitudes and pedagogic implications. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 65-76.
- He, D., & Miller, L. (2011). English teacher preference: the case of China's non- English-major students. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 428-443.
- He, D., & Zhang, Q. (2010). Native speaker norms and China English: From the perspective of learners and teachers in China. *TESOL quarterly*, 769-789.
- Hiep, P. H. (2007). Communicative language teaching: Unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 193-201.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 385-387.
- Holliday, A. (2013). 'Native Speaker' Teachers and cultural disbelief. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 17-26). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.



- Holliday, A. (2015). Native-speakerism: taking the concept forward and achieving cultural belief. In A. Swan, P. Aboshiha, & A. Holliday (Eds.), *(En) Countering Native-speakerism: Global Perspectives* (pp. 11-25). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The denial of ideology in perceptions of 'Nonnative Speake' teachers. *TESOL quarterly*, 43(4), 669-689.
- Houghton, S. A., & Rivers, D. J. (2013). Introduction: Redefining Native-Speakerism. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 1-14). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hsu, H. (2005). Mainland bias against Chinese from the west. *South China Morning Post*, 28, A16.
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93-105.
- Hu, G. (2005). 'CLT is best for China'—an untenable absolutist claim. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 65-68.
- Hu, G. (2009). The craze for English-medium education in China: Driving forces and looming consequences. *English Today*, 25(4), 47-54.
- Hu, X. (2004). Why China English should stand alongside British, American, and the other 'world Englishes'. *English Today*, 20(2), 26-33.
- Hu, X. (2005). China English, at home and in the world. *English Today*, 21(3), 27-38.
- Hundt, M., Zipp, L., & Huber, A. (2015). Attitudes in Fiji towards varieties of English. *World Englishes*, 34(4), 688-707.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ilieva, R. (2000). Exploring culture in texts designed for use in adult ESL classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*, 17(2), 50-63.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2005). Mind the gap: Self and perceived native speaker identities of EFL teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 265-281). New York: Springer.
- Jabeen, F., & Shah, S. K. (2011). The role of culture in ELT: Learners' attitude towards the teaching of target language culture. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 604-613.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL quarterly*, 39(3), 535-543.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(1), 157-181.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28(2), 200-207.
- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486-494.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching*, 44(3), 281-315.
- Jeon, M., & Lee, J. (2006). Hiring native-speaking English teachers in East Asian countries. *English Today*, 22(4), 53.

- Jin, J. (2005). Which is better in China, a local or a native English-speaking teacher? *English Today*, 21(3), 39-46.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2002). English language teaching in China: A bridge to the future. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 22(2), 53-64.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2006). Changing practices in Chinese cultures of learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 5-20.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Kabel, A. (2009). Native-speakerism, stereotyping and the collusion of applied linguistics. *System*, 37(1), 12-22.
- Kachru, B. B. (1983). *The indianization of English: the English language in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992a). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures (2nd ed.)* (pp. 48-74). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992b). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25(1), 1-14.
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (2004). *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (2016). The non-native English speaker teachers in TESOL movement. *ELT Journal*, 70(2), 180-189.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D., Aagard, A., Ching, A., Paik, M.-S. A., & Sasser, L. (2004). Teaching in kindergarten through grade 12 programs: Perceptions of native and nonnative English-speaking practitioners. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 81-99). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1967). Contrastive rhetoric and the teaching of composition. *TESOL quarterly*, 1(4), 10-16.
- Karim, K. (2004). *Post-secondary ESL Teachers' Perceptions, Attitudes and Expectations about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Bangladesh: Research Findings and Implementation Plan*. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Victoria. BC, Canada.
- Kelch, K., & Santana-Williamson, E. (2002). ESL students' attitudes toward native-and nonnative-speaking instructors' accents. *CATESOL journal*, 14(1), 57-72.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007a). Setting attainable and appropriate English language targets in multilingual settings: A case for Hong Kong. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 376-391.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007b). *World Englishes Paperback with Audio CD: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kirkpatrick, A. (2009). English as the international language of scholarship: implications for the dissemination of 'local' knowledge. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 254-270). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes*. New York: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Xu, Z. (2002). Chinese pragmatic norms and 'China English'. *World Englishes*, 21(2), 269-279.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the nonnative speaker. *PMLA. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 112(3), 359-369.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 199-212.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL quarterly*, 33(1), 9-35.
- Kubota, R. (2002). The Author Responds: (Un)Raveling Racism in a Field Like TESOL. *TESOL quarterly*, 36(1), 84-92.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race and TESOL: Introduction to concepts and theories. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(3), 471-493.
- Kubota, R., & Lin, A. M. (2009). *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003a). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 539-550.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003b). Problematizing cultural stereotypes in TESOL. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 709-719.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. New York: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2008). *Cultural globalization and language education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). Individual identity, cultural globalization, and teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. Mackay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (pp. 9-27). New York: Routledge.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2016). The Decolonial Option in English Teaching: Can the Subaltern Act? *TESOL quarterly*, 50(1), 66-85.
- Lai, H.-Y. T. (2008). English as an international language? Taiwanese university teachers' dilemma and struggle.... *English Today*, 24(3), 39-45.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2002). University students' perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness*, 11(2), 132-142.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Lee, I. (2011). Teaching how to discriminate: Globalization, prejudice, and textbooks. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 38(1), 47-63.
- Lee, S. M. (2005). The Pros and Cons of Task-based Instruction in Elementary English Classes. *English Teaching*, 60(2), 185-205.
- Leung, C. (2005). Convivial communication: recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 119-144.
- Li, D. C. S. (2009). Researching non-native speakers' views toward intelligibility and identity: Bridging the gap between moral high grounds and down-to-earth concerns. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 81-118). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Li, P. (2004). *Chinese EFL teachers' perceptions of implementation of communicative language teaching at tertiary level*. Unpublished Master's thesis. McGill University. Montreal, Canada.
- Liao, X. (2003). *Chinese secondary school EFL teachers' attitudes towards communicative language teaching and their classroom practices*. Unpublished Ph. D dissertation. The University of Auckland. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Liao, X. (2004). The need for communicative language teaching in China. *ELT Journal*, 58(3), 270-273.
- Lin, A. (2013a). Critical discourse analysis: overview. In C. Chapelle, A. (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1-5). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lin, A. (2013b). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL quarterly*, 47(3), 521-545.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. A. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lipovsky, C., & Mahboob, A. (2010). Appraisal of native and non-native English speaking teachers. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL* (pp. 154-179). Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars.
- Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 349-362.
- Liu, D. (1998). Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 3-10.
- Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL quarterly*, 33(1), 85-102.
- Liu, S., & Laohawiriyanon, C. (2014). Students' attitudes towards cultural learning in the English classroom: A case study of non-English major students in a Chinese university. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 2(2), 25-39.
- Llurda, E. (2004). Non- native- speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 314-323.
- Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. New York: Springer.
- Llurda, E. (2009). Attitudes towards English as an international language: The pervasiveness of native models among L2 users and teachers. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 119-134). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Llurda, E., & Huguet, n. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness*, 12(4), 220-233.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Lowe, R. J., & Pinner, R. (2016). Finding the connections between native-speakerism and authenticity. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 7(1), 27-52.
- Luk, J., & Lin, A. M. (2006). *Classroom Interactions as Cross-Cultural Encounters: Native Speakers in EFL Lessons*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ma, L. P. F. (2012). Advantages and disadvantages of native- and nonnative- English-speaking teachers: Student perceptions in Hong Kong. *TESOL quarterly*, 46(2), 280-305.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mahboob, A. (2003). *Status of nonnative English-speaking teachers in the United States*. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation. Indiana University. Bloomington, IN.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or non-native: What do the students think. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 121-147). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. In S. Zafar (Ed.), *Culture, context, & communication* (pp. 60-93). Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Center of Excellence for Applied Research and Training & The Military Language Institute.
- Mahboob, A. (Ed.) (2010). *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mahboob, A., & Golden, R. (2013). Looking for native speakers of English: Discrimination in English language teaching job advertisements. *Voices in Asia*, 3(18), 21.
- Mahboob, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K., & Hartford, B. (2004). Children of a lesser English: Nonnative English speakers as ESL teachers in English language programs in the United States. In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 100-120). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Marlina, R. (2014). The pedagogy of English as an International Language (EIL): More reflections and dialogues. In R. Marlina & R. A. Giri (Eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 1-19). New York: Springer.
- Martín, R. L., & van Dijk, T.A. (1997). "There was a Problem, and it was Solved!": Legitimizing the Expulsion of Illegal Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 8(4), 523-566.
- Matsuda, A. (2003a). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 719-729.
- Matsuda, A. (2003b). The ownership of English in Japanese secondary schools. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 483-496.
- Matsuda, A. (2006). Negotiating ELT assumptions in EIL classrooms. In J. Edge (Ed.), *(Re-) locating TESOL in an Age of Empire* (pp. 158-170). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Matsuda, A. (Ed.) (2012). *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language. New Perspectives on Language and Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Matsuda, A., & Friedrich, P. (2011). English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 332-344.
- Matsuura, H., Chiba, R., & Hilderbrandt, P. (2001). Beliefs about learning and teaching communicative English in Japan. *Japan Association for Language Teaching*, 23, 69-90.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1997). Designing a qualitative study: Handbook of applied social research methods. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 69-110). Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mayr, A. (2008). Introduction: Power, discourse and institutions. In A. Mayr (Ed.), *Language and power: An introduction to institutional discourse* (pp. 1-25). London: Continuum.
- McKay, S. L. (2000). Teaching English as an international language: Implications for cultural materials in the classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 9(4), 7-11.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2003a). Teaching English as an international language: The Chilean context. *ELT Journal*, 57(2), 139-148.
- McKay, S. L. (2003b). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.
- McKay, S. L. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 227-241). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- McKay, S. L. (2012a). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay, G. Hu, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. New York: Routledge.
- McKay, S. L. (2012b). Teaching materials for English as an international language. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (pp. 70-83). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McKay, S. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2008). *International English in its sociolinguistic contexts: Towards a socially sensitive EIL pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- McKenzie, R. M. (2008). Social factors and non- native attitudes towards varieties of spoken English: a Japanese case study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 63-88.
- McKenzie, R. M. (2013). Changing perceptions? A variationist sociolinguistic perspective on native speaker ideologies and standard English in Japan. In S. A. Houghton & D. J. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education* (pp. 219-230). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Mcmillan.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murica, D. M. Brinton, & S. M. A (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 429-442). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Methitham, P. (2012). White Prestige Ideology and its Effects on ELT Employment in Thailand. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 9(4), 145-156.
- Modiano, M. (2004). Monoculturalization and language dissemination. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 3(3), 215-227.
- MOE. (2007). *Daxue yingyu kecheng jiaoxue yaoqiu [English Curriculum requirements for institutions of higher learning]*. Beijing: Chinese Ministry of Education.
- MOE. (2011). *Yinyu Jiaoyu Yingyu kecheng biao zhun [English curriculum standard at Compulsory Education Stage]*. Beijing: Chinese Ministry of Education.
- MOE. (2017). *Daxue yingyu jiaoxue zhinan [College English teaching guideline]*. Beijing: Chinese Ministry of Education.
- Monfared, A., Mozaheb, M. A., & Shahiditabar, M. (2016). Where the difference lies: Teachers' perceptions toward cultural content of ELT books in three circles of world Englishes. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Moore, S. H., & Bounchan, S. (2010). English in Cambodia: Changes and challenges. *World Englishes*, 29(1), 114-126.
- Morgan, D. L. (1998). Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: Applications to health research. *Qualitative health research*, 8(3), 362-376.
- Moussu, L. (2002). *English as a Second Language Students' Reactions to Nonnative English-Speaking Teachers*. Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468879).
- Moussu, L. (2006a). Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English- speaking professionals. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(2), 455-457.
- Moussu, L. (2006b). *Native and Nonnative English-Speaking English as a Second Language Teachers: Student Attitudes, Teacher Self-Perceptions, and Intensive English Administrator Beliefs and Practices*. Ph.D dissertation, Perdue University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED492 599).
- Moussu, L. (2010a). Influence of Teacher- Contact Time and Other Variables on ESL Students' Attitudes Towards Native- and Nonnative- English- Speaking Teachers. *TESOL quarterly*, 44(4), 746-768.
- Moussu, L. (2010b). Toward a conversation between ESL teachers and intensive English program administrators. *TESOL Journal*, 1(4), 400-426.

- Moussu, L., & Llorca, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315-348.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Mumby, D. K. (2005). Theorizing resistance in organization studies A dialectical approach. *Management communication quarterly*, 19(1), 19-44.
- Mumby, D. & Clair, R. P. (1997) 'Organizational discourse', in van Dijk, T. A. (ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 181–205). New York: Sage.
- Nayar, P. B. (1994). Whose English is it. *TESL-EJ*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Newman, D., Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (1989). *The construction zone: Working for cognitive change in school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niu, Q., & Wolff, M. (2003). The Chinglish syndrome: Do recent developments endanger the language policy of China? *English Today*, 19(4), 30-35.
- Niu, Q., & Wolff, M. (2005). Is EFL a modern Trojan horse? *English Today*, 21(4), 55.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia- Pacific region. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613.
- Önal, O. (2005). EFL teachers' perceptions of the place of culture in ELT: A survey study at four universities in Ankara/Turkey. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(2), 215-235.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Pan, L. (2015). *English as a global language in China: Deconstructing the ideological discourses of English in language education*. New York: Springer.
- Pan, L., & Block, D. (2011). English as a “global language” in China: An investigation into learners' and teachers' language beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 391-402.
- Pan, L., & Seargeant, P. (2012). Is English a threat to Chinese language and culture? *English Today*, 28(03), 60-66.
- Park, G. (2012). I Am Never Afraid of Being Recognized as an NNEST: One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative- speaker identity *TESOL quarterly*, 46(1), 127-151.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). ELT and colonialism. In Cummins, J., & Davison, C. (Eds.). *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 13-24). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London: Routledge.
- Phan, L. H. (2008). *Teaching English as an international language: Identity, resistance and negotiation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Phan, L. H. (2014). The politics of naming: critiquing “learner-centred” and “teacher as facilitator” in English language and humanities classrooms. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(4), 392-405.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (2012) *Linguistic imperialism alive and kicking*. The Guardian, March 13.
- Phothongsunan, S., & Suwanarak, K. (2008). Native and non-native dichotomy: Distinctive stances of Thai teachers of English. *Abac Journal*, 28(2), 10-30.
- Pinner, R. (2014). The authenticity continuum: Towards a definition incorporating international voices. *English Today*, 30(4), 22-27.
- Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard language. *English Today*, 6(1), 3-10.

- Rafieyan, V., Eng, L. S., & Mohamed, A. R. (2013). Language learners' attitudes towards the incorporation of target language culture into foreign language instructions. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(4), pp. 169-177.
- Rahimi, M., & Naderi, F. (2014). The relationship between EFL teachers' attitudes towards CLT and perceived difficulties of implementing CLT in language classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(3), 237-245.
- Rajadurai, J. (2007). Intelligibility studies: A consideration of empirical and ideological issues. *World Englishes*, 26(1), 87-98.
- Rajagopalan, K. (2004). The concept of 'World English' and its implications for ELT. *ELT Journal*, 58(2), 111-117.
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44(2), 97-101.
- Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *System*, 30(1), 85-105.
- Rao, Z. (2013). Teaching English as a foreign language in China: looking back and forward. *English Today*, 29(3), 34-39.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (pp. 87-121). London: Sage.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-367.
- Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 781-807.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Ross, H. (1992). Foreign language education as a barometer of modernization. In R. Hayhoe (Ed.), *Education and modernization: The Chinese experience* (pp. 239-254). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Rudolph, N., Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2015). Conceptualizing and confronting inequity: Approaches within and new directions for the "NNEST movement". *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 12(1), 27-50.
- Ruecker, T. (2011). Challenging the native and nonnative English speaker hierarchy in ELT: New directions from race theory. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 8(4), 400-422.
- Ruecker, T., & Ives, L. (2015). White native English speakers needed: the rhetorical construction of privilege in online teacher recruitment spaces. *TESOL quarterly*, 49(4), 733-756.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Sandvik, E., Diener, E., & Seidlitz, L. (1993). Subjective well-being: The convergence and stability of self-report and non-self-report measures. *Journal of personality*, 61(3), 317-342.
- SAOFEA. (2015). *Waiguo zhuanjia laihua gongzuo xuke fuwu zhinan [Work Permit Service Guidance for Foreign Experts to Work in China]*. Beijing: Chinese National Foreign Expert Bureau.



- Saraceni, M. (2009). Relocating English: towards a new paradigm for English in the world. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 9(3), 175-186.
- Saraceni, M. (2010). *The relocation of English: Shifting paradigms in a global era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: a critical analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL*, 41(3), 223-250.
- Scales, J., Wennerstrom, A., Richard, D., & Wu, S. H. (2006). Language learners' perceptions of accent. *TESOL quarterly*, 40(4), 715-738.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & society*, 8(2), 165-187.
- Scheuer, J. (2003). Habitus as the principle for social practice: A proposal for critical discourse analysis. *Language in Society*, 32(2), 143-175.
- Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 7(5), 379-392.
- Seargeant, P. (2012). *Exploring world Englishes: Language in a global context*. New York: Routledge.
- Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 233-245.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 339.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209-232.
- Selvi, A. F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1, 156-181. Retrieved on June 120th, 2015 from <https://sites.google.com/site/watesolnnestcaucus/caucus-annual-review>
- Selvi, A. F. (2011). The non-native speaker teacher. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 187-189.
- Selvi, A. F. (2014). Myths and misconceptions about nonnative English speakers in the TESOL (NNEST) movement. *TESOL Journal*, 5(3), 573-611.
- Shao, T. (2005). Teaching English in China: NNESTS need not apply. *NNest Newsletter*, 7(2).
- Sharifian, F. (2009). English as the international language: an overview. In F. Sharifian (Ed.), *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 1-18). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Sharifian, F. (2013). Globalisation and developing metacultural competence in learning English as an International Language. *Multilingual Education*, 3(7), 1-11.
- Shin, H. (2006). Rethinking TESOL From a SOL's Perspective: Indigenous Epistemology and Decolonizing Praxis in TESOL. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 3(2-3), 147-167.
- Shuck, G. (2006). Racializing the nonnative English speaker. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 5(4), 259-276.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard educational review*, 57(1), 1-23.
- Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A. (2005). Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs. *TESOL quarterly*, 39(3), 467-488.
- Silverstein, M. (1992) The indeterminacy of contextualization: When is enough enough? In Auer P and Di Luzio A (eds), *The Contextualization of Language*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. 55-76.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). The globalisation of (educational) language rights. *International Review of Education*, 47(3-4), 201-219.

- Slembrouck, S. (2001). Explanation, interpretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(1), 33-57.
- Smith, L. E. (1992). Spread of English and issues of intelligibility. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 75-90). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Smith, L. E., & Nelson, C. L. (1985). International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4(3), 333-342.
- Stening, B. W., & Everett, J. E. (1984). Response styles in a cross-cultural managerial study. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 122(2), 151-156.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded Theory, Procedures and Techniques* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan & A. Wray (Eds.), *Evolving models of language* (pp. 100-116). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, .
- Suárez, J. (2000). 'Native' and 'Non-native': Not Only a Question of Terminology. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 2(6), Retrieved on May 5th, 2015 from <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/nov2000/index.htm>.
- Subtirelu, N. (2013). What (do) learners want (?): a re-examination of the issue of learner preferences regarding the use of 'native' speaker norms in English language teaching. *Language Awareness*, 22(3), 270-291.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2013). English as a lingua franca and its implications for English language teaching. *JALT journal*, 35(2), 177-194.
- Sung, C. C. M. (2014). An exploratory study of Hong Kong students' perceptions of native and non-native English-speaking teachers in ELT. *Asian Englishes*, 16(1), 32-46.
- Sung, D., & Chen, P.-W. (2009). Incorporating English-language cultures into English learning: Viewpoints from university English faculty in Taiwan. *The International Journal of Learning*, 16(3), 301-313.
- Suresh, B. (2000). Native English must be a white thing. *South China Morning Post*. November 15, 17.
- Tang, C. (1997). On the power and status of non-native ESL teachers. *TESOL quarterly*, 31(3), 577-580.
- Thomas, J. (1999). Voices from the periphery: Non-native teachers and issues of credibility. In G. Brain (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 5-13). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tillmann-Healy, L. M. (2003). Friendship as method. *Qualitative inquiry*, 9(5), 729-749.
- Timmis, I. (2002). Native- speaker norms and International English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 240-249.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis: In search of meaning*. London: Sage.
- Tokumoto, M., & Shibata, M. (2011). Asian varieties of English: Attitudes towards pronunciation. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 392-408.
- Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural imperialism: A critical introduction*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2013). *International English: A Guide to the Varieties of Standard English* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Tsui, A. B., & Tollefson, J. W. (Eds.). (2007). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. New York: Routledge.
- Tupas, R. (Ed.) (2015). *Unequal Englishes: The politics of Englishes today*. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & society*, 4(2), 249-283.

- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schaffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and peace* (pp. 17-33). Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001a). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001b). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia linguistica*, 35(1-2), 11-40.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & society*, 17(3), 359-383.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 62-86). Los Angeles: Sage.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91-112.
- van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse studies*, 1(1), 83-118.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (ed. Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S. & Souberman, E.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wallis, D. A. (1998). Language, attitude, and ideology: An experimental social-psychological study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(1), 21-48.
- Wang, F. (2010). The selection and allocation of cultures in College-English textbooks- Taking two series of College-English comprehensive coursebooks as an Example. *Journal of Xi'an International Studies University*, 18(2), 101-104.
- Wang, H., & Hill, C. (2011). A paradigm shift for English language teaching in Asia: From imposition to accommodation. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 8(4), 205-232.
- Wang, S. (2016). On the transformation of English language education in China [Tan Zhongguo Yingyu Jiaoyu De Zhuanxing]. *Journal of Foreign Languages [Wai Guo Yu]*, 39(3), 2-4.
- Wang, S. & Wang, H. (2011). On the State of College English Teaching in China and Its Future Development [Woguo Xiaoxiao Daxue Yingyu Jiaoxue Xianzhuan Diaocha Ji Daxue Yingyu Jiaoxue Gaige Yu Fazhan Fangxiang]. *Foreign Languages in China [Zhongguo Waiyu]*, 8(5), 4-17.
- Wang, W. (2015). Teaching English as an international language in China: Investigating university teachers' and students' attitudes towards China English. *System*, 53, 60-72.
- Wang, Yan. (2011). Eastern vs Western: Undertaking Asian ELT under a Framework of Relevance. *Asian Englishes*, 14(2), 40-55.
- Wang, Ying. (2013). Non-conformity to ENL norms: a perspective from Chinese English users. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2), 255-282.
- Waugh, L. R., Catalano, T., Al Masaeed, K., Do, T. H., & Renigar, P. G. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis: Definition, Approaches, Relation to Pragmatics, Critique, and Trends. In A. Capone & J. L. Mey (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society* (pp. 71-135). New York: Springer.
- Wegener, D. T., & Fabrigar, L. R. (2004). Constructing and Evaluating Quantitative Measures for Social Psychological Research. In C. Sansone, C. C. Morf, & A. T. Panter (Eds.), *The handbook of methods in social psychology* (pp. 145-172). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wei, M. (2016). Language ideology and identity seeking: Perceptions of college learners of English in China. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 15(2), 100-113.
- Wei, R., & Su, J. (2012). The statistics of English in China. *English Today*, 28(3), 10-14.

- Wen, Q. (2012a). English as a lingua franca: A pedagogical perspective. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(2), 371-376.
- Wen, Q. (2012b). Teaching English as an international language in mainland China. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.), *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 79-93). New York: Springer.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1998a). Context, community, and authentic language. *TESOL quarterly*, 32(4), 705-716.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1998b). REVIEW ARTICLE The Theory and Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 136-151.
- Wiley, T. G., & Lukes, M. (1996). English- only and standard English ideologies in the US. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30(3), 511-535.
- Williams, J. M. (2003). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Longman.
- Wink, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. In B. L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 173-200). London: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (1999). Critical discourse analysis at the end of the 20th century. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 32(1-2), 185-193.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2010). The glocalization of politics in television: Fiction or reality? *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(1), 43-62.
- Wodak, R. (2012). What Critical Discourse Analysis is About? In H. Tian & F. Zhao (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Essential Readings* (pp. 90-107). Tianjin, China: Nankai University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 14(1), 87-109.
- Wodak, R., de Cilla, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Fairclough, N. (2010). Recontextualizing European higher education policies: The cases of Austria and Romania. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(1), 19-40.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, Agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-33). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2001). Discourse and racism. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (Ed.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 372-397). Malden, MA: Backwell.
- Woods, D. (2003). The social construction of beliefs in the language classroom. In P. Kalaja & A. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 201-229). New York: Springer.
- Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Xiao, J. (2010). *Cultural contents of an in-use EFL textbook and English major students' attitudes and perceptions towards culture learning at Jiangxi University of Science and Technology, China*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Prince of Songkla University. Songkhla, Thailand.
- Xiong, T., & Qian, Y. (2012). Ideologies of English in a Chinese high school EFL textbook: a critical discourse analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 32(1), 75-92.

- Xu, J., & Van de Poel, K. (2011). English as a lingua franca in Flanders: A study of university students' attitudes. *English Text Construction*, 4(2), 257-278.
- Xu, Z. (2010). *Chinese English: Features and implications*. Hong Kong: Open University of Hong Kong Press.
- Yang, C., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). China English in trouble: Evidence from dyadic teacher talk. *System*, 51, 39-50.
- Young, T. J., & Sachdev, I. (2011). Intercultural communicative competence: Exploring English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Awareness*, 20(2), 81-98.
- Young, T. J., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(2), 123-137.
- Yu, L. (2001). Communicative language teaching in China: Progress and resistance. *TESOL quarterly*, 35(1), 194-198.
- Zhang, B., & Ma, L. (2004). An Investigation of the Cultural Content of College-English Coursebooks *Foreign Language World [Wai Yu Jie]*, 105(4), 60-66.
- Zhong, M., & Sun, Y. (2014). Concentrating on cultivating talent, Initiating comprehensive teaching reforms and development of foreign language [Yi Rencai Peiyang Wei Zhongxin, Quanmian Tuijin Waiyu Lei Zhuanye Jiaoxue Gaige yu Fazhan]. *Foreign Language World [Wai Yu Jie]*, 160(1), 2-8.
- Zhou, C. (2007). Global Englishes: A challenge for English pedagogy in China. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 2, 82-102. Retrived on June, 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016 from <http://asian-efl-journal.com/eilj/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/2-december%202007.pdf>.

## Appendix 1-A Questionnaire for Students (Initial) <sup>[18]</sup>

### Chinese version (original)

#### I. 认知态度 (共 25 项)

(数字“1-5”分别代表对您个人对每项陈述的看法: “1”表示“强烈不同意”; “2”表示“不同意”; “3”表示“不确定”; “4”表示“同意”; “5”表示“强烈同意”。请在每项陈述后面的空格内添上相应数字。)

1	英语母语国家(例如, 英国、美国等)的英语比英语作为第二语言国家(例如, 印度、新加坡等)的英语更为标准。	
2	外教最好是以英语为母语的人。	
3	英语母语者的英语为标准英语。	
4	要学好英语, 学习者要以英语母语者的语言标准为参照。	
5	西方国家“以学生为中心”的教学方法(例如, “交际法”)体现了先进的教育理念。	
6	英语母语国家(例如, 英国、美国等)的英语比英语作为外语国家(例如, 中国、韩国等)的英语更为标准。	
7	英语学习者首先应该学习了解自身民族文化。	
8	要学好英语, 学习者需要模仿英语母语者的发音。	
9	了解英语母语国家文化(特别是英美社会文化)是学好英语的前提条件。	
10	与我国英语教师相比, 英语母语者外教的英语更标准。	
11	使用西方国家“以学生为中心”的教学方法(例如, “交际法”)宜于营造一种自由的课堂氛围。	
12	要学好英语, 学习者需要模仿英语母语者的口语表达习惯。	
13	英语学习者需要学习了解不同国家(包括英语母语国家和非英语母语国家)的文化。	
14	与我国英语教师相比, 英语母语者外教的教学方法更灵活多样。	
15	使用西方国家“以学生为中心”的教学方法(例如, “交际法”)有助于提高学习者的英语使用能力。	
16	除英语母语国家的英语之外, 学习者还需要学习其它国家的英语变体(例如, “印度英语”、“新加坡英语”和“中国英语”等)。	

<sup>[18]</sup> This is the version of the questionnaire used for the first pilot survey of the students. Its format is slightly different from the original, but the question items are the same. The format issue is the true of all the other appendices.

17	我国英语课堂活动要以模拟英语母语者间的交际活动为导向。	
18	与我国英语教师相比，英语母语者外教更了解英语母语国家的文化。	
19	非英语母语者的英语也应该被视为标准英语。	
20	使用西方国家“以学生为中心”的教学方法（例如，“交际法”）有助于提高学生的英语口语表达能力。	
21	与我国英语教师相比，英语母语者外教更能调动学生的学习热情。	
22	英语课堂教学内容应侧重学习者自身民族文化。	
23	与我国英语教师相比，英语母语者外教更了解英语的使用规则。	
24	要学好英语，英语学习者需要模仿英语母语者的书面语表达习惯。	
25	我国英语课堂教学内容应侧重英语母语国家的文化。	

### III. 行为倾向（共 5 项）

（此部分为单选题。请根据每个问题后的选项进行选择，并说明原因。）

- 26 以下五位英语教师教学能力相当。您首选哪位老师的课？

教师 A：来自英语母语国家，母语为英语；  
 教师 B：来自于英语国家，华裔(但不懂汉语)，母语为英语；  
 教师 C：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，母语为英语；  
 教师 D：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，英语为第二语言；  
 教师 E：中国本土英语教师，英语为外语。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 27 以下四套包含不同文化内容的英语教材供学生推荐给教师使用，您首推哪套？

教材 A：单纯包括英语母语国家的文化，特别是英美社会文化；  
 教材 B：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量英语作为第二语言国家的文化内容；  
 教材 C：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量中国文化内容；  
 教材 D：反映英语母语国家、英语作为第二语言国家、中国和其它英语作为外语国家文化的内容所占比例大体相当。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 28 以下四类学生，您最希望自己成为哪类学生？

学生 A：语音非常接近英语本族语者，经常被人误认为是英语本族语者；  
 学生 B：语音接近英语本族语者，有时被人误认为是英语本族语者；  
 学生 C：英语语音很清晰，容易为人理解，但有明显中国口音；  
 学生 D：中国口音较重，但不影响与英语本族语者和非英语本族语者交流。

您的选择：  
原因：

- 29 以下四类英语教学方式，您最希望老师采用哪一种？  
方式 A：当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法（以学生为中心的教学方法）；  
方式 B：我国传统的英语教学方法（以教师为中心的教学方法）；  
方式 C：以当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法为主，以我国传统英语教学方法为辅；  
方式 D：以我国传统英语教学方法为主，以当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法为辅；  
您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_  
原因：

- 30 以下有三种类型的英语，您最希望学习哪一种？  
英语 A：英语母语国家的英语；  
英语 B：英语作为第二语言国家的英语（例如，新加坡英语等）；  
英语 C：“中国英语”（遵循英语母语者的语法，但词汇和表达方式具有中国文化特色的英语）。  
您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_  
原因：

### III. 背景信息

（根据自己的实际情况，请在各选项数字处打勾。）

性别	(1) 男	(2) 女			
专业背景	(1) 工科	(2) 理科	(3) 社会	(4) 人文	(5) 商科
海外经历	(1) 有	(2) 无			
是否上过 外教的课	(1) 有	(2) 无			
英语水平 自我评价	(1) 优	(2) 良	(3) 中	(4) 不理想	
英语学习 目的	(1) 出国留学	(2) 求职需求	(3) 满足学校 课程学习要求	(4) 其它	

**如果您对此研究感兴趣，希望参加下一步的访谈，请留下您认为方便的一种联系方式。**

姓名：\_\_\_\_\_  
邮箱：\_\_\_\_\_

QQ 号码：\_\_\_\_\_  
手机号码：\_\_\_\_\_

（问卷结束，感谢您的支持）



## **English version (translated)**

### **I. Cognitive attitude (25 items)**

(Numbers 1-5 represents respectively your personal viewpoint on each statement, with “1” standing for “strongly disagree”, “2” for “disagree”, “3” for “not sure”, “4” for “agree” and “5” for “strongly agree”. Please fill the corresponding number in the block after each statement.)

1	Compared with that of English as a second language countries (e.g., India, Singapore, etc.), the English language of native English speaking countries (e.g., Britain, America, etc.) is more standard.	
2	It is most expected that foreign teachers are native English speakers.	
3	The English language of native English speakers is Standard English.	
4	To learn English well, learners need to follow the language norms of native English speakers.	
5	The “student-centered” teaching approach from Western countries (e.g., communicative language teaching) represents an advanced education philosophy.	
6	Compared with that of English as a foreign language countries (e.g., China, Korea, etc.), the English language of native English speaking countries is more standard.	
7	English language learners should first learn about their own national culture.	
8	To learn English well, learners need to imitate the pronunciation of native English speakers.	
9	To learn about the culture of native English speaking countries (particularly Anglo-American culture) is the prerequisite of the acquisition of the English language.	
10	Compared with Chinese EFL teachers, native English speaker teachers speak more standard English.	
11	The adoption of the “student-centered” teaching approach from Western countries (e.g., communicative language teaching) is conducive for creating a free classroom atmosphere.	
12	To learn English well, learners need to imitate the oral expressions of native English speakers.	
13	English language learners need to learn about the culture of different countries (including native English speaking countries and nonnative English speaking countries).	
14	Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers adopt diverse instructional modes.	
15	The adoption of the “student-centered” teaching approach from Western countries (e.g., communicative language teaching) is conducive for improving students’ capability of using English practically.	
16	In addition to the English language of native English speaking countries, learners need to learn the English language of other countries (e.g., Indian English, Singaporean English and China English, etc.).	
17	English language classroom activities in China should be oriented toward those of communication between native English speakers.	

18	Compared with Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers know more about the culture of native English speaking countries.	
19	The English language of nonnative English speakers should also be viewed as Standard English.	
20	The adoption of the “student-centered” teaching approach from Western countries (e.g., communicative language teaching) is conducive for improving students’ oral English proficiency.	
21	Compared with Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers are more capable of stimulating students’ enthusiasm in learning.	
22	The content of English language classroom teaching should focus on learners’ national culture.	
23	Compared with Chinese EFL teachers, native English speaker teachers know more about the pragmatic rules of the English language	
24	To learn English well, learners need to imitate the writing convention of native English speakers.	
25	The content of English language classroom teaching in China should focus on the culture of native English speaking countries.	

## II. Behavioral tendency (5 items)

(This section includes multiple-choice questions. Please make your choice according to the answers provided to each question, and explain your choice.)

- 26 Of the following five English language teachers with almost the same teaching competence, whose class do you expect most to attend?

Teacher A: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country

Teacher B: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country, with a Chinese pedigree (but with no knowledge of the Chinese language)

Teacher C: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as his/her first language

Teacher D: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as a second language

Teacher E: a local Chinese English teacher, with English as a foreign language

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 27 If allowed to recommend to your teacher one of the following four sets of English language textbooks with different cultural content, which one would be your first choice?

Textbook A: including merely the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture

Textbook B: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of the culture of English as a second language countries

Textbook C: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of Chinese culture

Textbook D: with the content that reflects cultures of native English speaking countries, English as a second language countries, China and other countries equally distributed

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 28 Of the following four types of students, which one do you expect most to be?
- Student A: His/her pronunciation is very close to that of a native English speaker. He/she is often taken as a native English speaker.
- Student B: His/her pronunciation is close to that of a native English speaker. Sometimes, he/she is taken as a native English speaker.
- Student C: His/her English pronunciation is clear and easy to understand. But he/she has a visible Chinese accent.
- Student D: He/she has a heavy Chinese accent, but this does not affect his/her communication with (non)native English speakers.
- Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_
- Reasons:
- 29 Of the following four types of teaching approaches, which one do you expect most your teacher to adopt?
- Approach A: the teaching approach currently popular in native English speaking countries (the student-centered teaching approach)
- Approach B: the traditional teaching approach of China (the teacher-centered teaching approach)
- Approach C: the approach with A as the main strategy and B as an auxiliary
- Approach D: the approach with B as the main strategy and A as an auxiliary
- Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_
- Reasons:
- 30 Of the following three types of English language varieties, which one do you expect most to learn?
- Variety A: the English language of native English speaking countries
- Variety B: the English language of English as a second language country
- Variety C: "China English" (an English variety that follows the grammar of native-speaker English but is characterized with Chinese culture in vocabulary and expression)
- Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_
- Reasons:

### III. Background information

(Please tick the number before each item for selection according to your own situation.)

- Sex (1) male (2) female
- Specialized area (1) Engineering (2) Science (3) Social Sciences (4) Humanities (5) Business
- Overseas experiences (1) Yes (2) No
- English Learning experiences with foreign teachers (1) Yes (2) No
- Self-rated English proficiency (1) excellent (2) good (3) moderate (4) unsatisfied
- English learning objective (1) study abroad (2) job hunting (3) to meet the school requirement (4) others

**If you are interested in this research and want to participate in the follow-up interview, please provide you contact information.**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

QQ: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell phone: \_\_\_\_\_

( This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your support. )

## Appendix 1-B Questionnaire for Students (Final) <sup>[19]</sup>

### Chinese version (original)

#### I. 认知态度 (共 21 项)

(数字“1-5”分别代表对您个人对每项陈述的看法: “1”表示“强烈不同意”; “2”表示“不同意”; “3”表示“不确定”; “4”表示“同意”; “5”表示“强烈同意”。请在每项陈述后面的相应数字上打勾。)

1	与英语作为第二语言国家(例如, 印度)的英语相比, 英语母语国家的英语相对容易听懂。	1	2	3	4	5
2	英语母语国家的英语比英语作为第二语言国家(例如, 印度)的英语更为纯正。	1	2	3	4	5
3	英语母语国家的英语比英语作为外语国家(例如, 中国)的英语更为标准。	1	2	3	4	5
4	在不同类型国家的英语中, 我觉得英语母语国家的英语最为地道。	1	2	3	4	5
5	要学好英语, 学习者需要遵循英语母语者的语言标准。	1	2	3	4	5
6	要学好英语, 学习者需要模仿英语母语者的发音。	1	2	3	4	5
7	要学好英语, 学习者需要模仿英语母语者的口语表达习惯。	1	2	3	4	5
8	要学好英语, 英语学习者需要模仿英语母语者的书面语表达方式。	1	2	3	4	5
9	与我国传统以教师为中心的教学方法相比, 西方国家以学生为中心的英语教学法, 体现了一种先进的教学理念。	1	2	3	4	5
10	与我国传统以教师为中心的教学方法相比, 使用西方国家以学生为中心的英语教学法, 宜于营造一种自由的课堂氛围。	1	2	3	4	5
11	与我国传统以教师为中心的教学方法相比, 使用西方国家以学生为中心的英语教学法, 有助于提高学习者的学习兴趣。	1	2	3	4	5
12	与我国传统以教师为中心的教学方法相比, 使用西方国家以学生为中心的英语教学法, 有助于提高学生的英语口语表达能力。	1	2	3	4	5
13	英语以传统英语母语国家(例如, 英国、美国等)的文化为依托。	1	2	3	4	5
14	一些国家(例如, 印度)把英语作为第二语言, 但是它们的文化不是英语文化的基础。	1	2	3	4	5
15	一些国家(例如, 中国)把英语作为外语, 但是它们的文化不能构成英语文化的真正成分。	1	2	3	4	5
16	虽然在当今世界不同国家的文化融入到英语中, 但是英语真正承载的还是传统英语母语国家的文化。	1	2	3	4	5
17	与我国多数英语教师相比, 英语母语者外教的英语更标准。	1	2	3	4	5
18	与我国多数英语教师相比, 英语母语者外教更了解英语背后的文化。	1	2	3	4	5

<sup>[19]</sup> This is the final version of the questionnaire for students. It is the same as the version used for the second pilot survey, the results of which indicate that the questionnaire is of reliability and validity and can be adopted for this study.

19	与我国多数英语教师相比，英语母语者外教的教学方法更灵活。	1	2	3	4	5
20	与我国多数英语教师相比，英语母语者外教更了解英语在生活中的使用规则。	1	2	3	4	5
21	与我国多数英语教师相比，英语母语者外教更能调动学生的学习热情。	1	2	3	4	5

### III. 行为倾向（共 5 项）

（此部分为单选题。 请根据每个问题后的选项进行选择，并说明原因。）

- 22 以下五位英语教师教学能力相当。您首选哪位老师的课？

教师 A：来自英语母语国家，母语为英语；

教师 B：来自于英语国家，华裔(但不懂汉语)，母语为英语；

教师 C：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，母语为英语；

教师 D：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，英语为第二语言；

教师 E：中国本土英语教师，英语为外语。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 23 以下四套包含不同文化内容的英语教材供学生推荐给教师使用，您首推哪套？

教材 A：单纯包括英语母语国家的文化，特别是英美社会文化；

教材 B：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量英语作为第二语言国家的文化内容；

教材 C：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量中国文化内容；

教材 D：反映英语母语国家、英语作为第二语言国家、中国和其它英语作为外语国家文化的内容所占比例大体相当。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 24 以下四类学生，您最希望自己成为哪类学生？

学生 A：语音非常接近英语本族语者，经常被人误认为是英语本族语者；

学生 B：语音接近英语本族语者，有时被人误认为是英语本族语者；

学生 C：英语语音很清晰，容易为人理解，但有明显中国口音；

学生 D：中国口音较重，但不影响与英语本族语者和非英语本族语者交流。

您的选择：

原因：

- 25 以下四类英语教学方式，您最希望老师采用哪一种？

方式 A：当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法（以学生为中心的教学方法）；

方式 B：我国传统的英语教学方法（以教师为中心的教学方法）；

方式 C：以当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法为主，以我国传统英语教学方法为辅；

方式 D：以我国传统英语教学方法为主，以当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法为辅；

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

26 以下有三种类型的英语，您最希望学习哪一种？

英语 A: 英语母语国家的英语;

英语 B: 英语作为第二语言国家的英语 (例如, 新加坡英语等);

英语 C: “中国英语”(遵循英语母语者的语法, 但词汇和表达方式具有中国文化特色的英语)。

您的选择: \_\_\_\_\_

原因:

### III. 背景信息

(根据自己的实际情况, 请在各选项数字处打勾。)

性别 (1) 男 (2) 女

专业背景 (1) 工科 (2) 理科 (3) 社会 (4) 人文 (5)商科

海外经历 (1) 有 (2) 无

是否上过 (1) 有 (2) 无

### 外教的课

英语水平 (1) 优 (2) 良 (3) 中 (4) 不理想

### 自我评价

英语学习的目的 (1) 出国留学 (2) 求职需求 (3) 满足学校课程学习要求 (4) 其它

如果您对此研究感兴趣，希望参加下一步的访谈，请留下您认为方便的一种联系方式。

姓名: 邮箱:

QQ 号码: 手机号码:

(问卷结束,感谢您的支持)

## **English version (translated)**

### **I. Cognitive attitude (21 items)**

(Numbers 1-5 represents respectively your personal viewpoint on each statement, with “1” standing for “strongly disagree”, “2” for “disagree”, “3” for “not sure”, “4” for “agree” and “5” for “strongly agree”. Please tick the number after each statement according to your choice.)

1	Compared with that of English as a second language countries (e.g., India), the English language of native English speaking countries is more intelligible.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Compared with that of English as a second language countries (e.g., India), the English language of native English speaking countries is more authentic.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Compared with that of English as a foreign language countries (e.g., China), the English language of native English speaking countries is more standard.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Of the English language varieties of different countries, I think that of native English speaking countries is the most standard.	1	2	3	4	5
5	To learn English well, learners need to follow the language norms of native English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
6	To learn English well, learners need to imitate the pronunciation of native English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
7	To learn English well, learners need to imitate the oral expressions of native English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
8	To learn English well, learners need to imitate the writing convention of native English speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the student-centered teaching approach from native English speaking countries represents an advanced education philosophy.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the application of the student-centered teaching approach from native English speaking countries is conducive for creating a free classroom atmosphere.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the application of the student-centered teaching approach from native English speaking countries is conducive for enhancing students learning interests.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, the application of the student-centered teaching approach from native English speaking countries is conducive for improving students' oral English proficiency.	1	2	3	4	5
13	The English language is based on the culture of traditional native English speaking countries (e.g., Britain, America, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
14	Some countries (e.g., India) take English as the second language, but their cultures are not the base of English.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Some countries (e.g., China) take English as a foreign language, but their cultures cannot become its real cultural ingredients.	1	2	3	4	5
16	The English language really conveys is the culture of traditional native English speaking countries, though the cultures of other countries have currently entered it on a large scale.	1	2	3	4	5

17	Compared with that of most Chinese English language teachers, the English language of native English speaker teachers is more standard.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers know more about the culture underlying the English language.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers adopt diverse instructional modes.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers know more about the pragmatic rules of the English language	1	2	3	4	5
21	Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers are more capable of stimulating students' enthusiasm in learning.	1	2	3	4	5

## II. Behavioral tendency (5 items)

(This section includes multiple-choice questions. Please make your choice according to the answers provided to each question, and explain your choice.)

- 22 Of the following five English language teachers with almost the same teaching competence, whose class do you expect most to attend?

Teacher A: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country

Teacher B: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country, with a Chinese pedigree (but with no knowledge of the Chinese language)

Teacher C: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as his/her first language

Teacher D: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as a second language

Teacher E: a local Chinese English teacher, with English as a foreign language

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 23 If allowed to recommend to your teacher one of the following four sets of English language textbooks with different cultural content, which one would be your first choice?

Textbook A: including merely the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture

Textbook B: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of the culture of English as a second language countries

Textbook C: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of Chinese culture

Textbook D: with the content that reflects cultures of native English speaking countries, English as a second language countries, China and other countries equally distributed

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 24 Of the following four types of students, which one do you expect most to be?

Student A: His/her pronunciation is very close to that of a native English speaker. He/she is often taken as a native English speaker.



Student B: His/her pronunciation is close to that of a native English speaker. Sometimes, he/she is taken as a native English speaker.

Student C: His/her English pronunciation is clear and easy to understand. But he/she has a visible Chinese accent.

Student D: He/she has a heavy Chinese accent, but this does not affect his/her communication with (non)native English speakers.

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 25 Of the following four types of teaching approaches, which one do you expect most your teacher to adopt?

Approach A: the teaching approach currently popular in native English speaking countries (the student-centered teaching approach)

Approach B: the traditional teaching approach of China (the teacher-centered teaching approach)

Approach C: the approach with A as the main strategy and B as an auxiliary

Approach D: the approach with B as the main strategy and A as an auxiliary

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 26 Of the following three types of English language varieties, which one do you expect most to learn?

Variety A: the English language of native English speaking countries

Variety B: the English language of English as a second language country

Variety C: "China English" (an English variety that follows the grammar of native-speaker English but is characterized with Chinese culture in vocabulary and expression)

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

### III. Background information

(Please tick the number before each item for selection according to your own situation.)

Sex (1) male (2) female

Specialization (1) Engineering (2) Science (3) Social Sciences (4) Humanities (5) Business

Overseas experiences (1) Yes (2) No

English Learning experiences with foreign teachers (1) Yes (2) No

Self-rated English proficiency (1) excellent (2) good (3) moderate (4) unsatisfied

English learning objective (1) study abroad (2) for job hunting (3) to meet the school requirement (4) others

**If you are interested in this research and want to participate in the follow-up interview, please provide you contact information.**

Name: Email:

QQ: Cell phone:

(This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your support.)

## Appendix 1-C Cover Letter of the Questionnaire for Students

### **Chinese version (original)**

我叫刘君栓，河北科技大学外国语学院教师，目前正在攻读利物浦大学英语专业的博士学位。我研究课题的题目为“英语教育中的‘英本主义’：一项关于中国英语教育的个案研究”。

问卷包括认知态度、行为倾向和个人背景信息等三部分内容，旨在了解您对英语教育领域关于“教师语言身份”、“英语标准”、“文化取向”和“教学途径或方法”等四个维度问题的态度。

我将严格遵守科研数据收集和管理原的国际惯例，特别是利物浦大学的科研操作和管理的伦理规范，对您所提供的数据采取严格保密措施，并保证您参与此项问卷调查活动不会给您带来任何负面影响。

参与本问卷调查活动纯属自愿。如果您对本研究感兴趣，并愿意参加下一步的访谈环节，请留下您的联系方式。如果您有什么问题，请随时联系我。

感谢您的支持和帮助。

调查者：刘君栓

邮箱：liujunshuan@hotmail.com

QQ：2586866424

日期：2014 年 11 月 8 日

### **English version (translated)**

My name is Junshuan Liu, a teacher working at School of Foreign Languages, Hebei University of Science and Technology (HEBUST). I am currently working on the doctoral degree in English at University of Liverpool. The topic of my research project is *Native-speakerism in ELT: A case study of English language education in China*.

The questionnaire consists of three sections, including cognitive attitude, behavioral tendency, and personal background information. The survey is targeted at investigating your attitude toward four issues in the realm of English language education regarding teachers' first language backgrounds, English language standard, cultural orientations and teaching approaches/methods.

I will abide by strictly the international practice in relation to data collection and management, particularly the ethics on research conduct and management of University of Liverpool, take strict security measures to protect the data you supply, and guarantee that your participating in this questionnaire survey will not bring about any side effect on you.

Please be noted that to participate in this survey is on a voluntary basis. If you feel interested in this study and hope to attend the follow-up interview, please provide your contact information. Should you have any questions, please contact me anytime.

Thank you for your support and help.

Researcher: Junshuan Liu  
Email : liujunshuan@hotmail.com  
QQ : 2586866424  
Data: November 10th, 2014

## Appendix 2-A Questionnaire for Teachers (Initial) <sup>[20]</sup>

### Chinese version (original)

阅读问卷之前，请注意问卷中所涉及的几个概念

- ❖ 英语母语国家是指英国、美国和加拿大等传统英语国家；英语作为第二语言国家指新加坡、印度等国；英语作为外语国家是指中国、日本、韩国等国。
- ❖ “交际型教学途径”是指以学生为“中心”、教师为“疏导者”，以“任务活动”为课堂教学活动主线，旨在培养学生英语应用能力的课堂教学方式。

### I 教学行为（共 10 项）

（请结合您个人的教学实际情况就下列陈述作答。数字“1-3”分别代表不同的频度：“1”表示“几乎没有”；“2”表示“有时”；“3”表示“经常”。请在每项陈述后面的相应数字上打勾。）

1	我告诉学生没有必要模仿英语母语者的语音。	1	2	3
2	我要求学生模仿英语母语者的口语表达方式。	1	2	3
3	我要求学生模仿英语母语者的写作方式。	1	2	3
4	我在课堂上组织学生进行“小组合作式”的学习活动。	1	2	3
5	我引导学生适应“交际型”课堂教学方式。	1	2	3
6	我在课堂上讲解英语母语国家的文化。	1	2	3
7	我在课堂上讲解英语作为第二语言国家的文化。	1	2	3
8	我告诉学生学习英语不是为了融入英语母语文化圈。	1	2	3
9	我告诉学生学习英语更多是为了与其他非英语母语者交流。	1	2	3
10	我在课堂上介绍英语母语国家之外的英语。	1	2	3

### II 心理认知（共 15 项）

（数字“1-5”分别代表对您个人对每项陈述的看法：“1”表示“强烈不同意”；“2”表示“不同意”；“3”表示“中立”；“4”表示“同意”；“5”表示“强烈同意”。请在每项陈述后面的相应数字上打勾。）

11	英语母语国家的英语是标准英语。	1	2	3	4	5
12	非英语母语国家的英语不是标准英语。	1	2	3	4	5
13	英语教学应该参照英语母语国家的英语标准。	1	2	3	4	5

<sup>[20]</sup> This is the version of the questionnaire adopted for the first pilot survey of the teachers.

14	多数来自英语作为第二语言国家的外教口音很重。	1	2	3	4	5
15	英语学习者一定要努力摆脱母语文化的干扰。	1	2	3	4	5
16	以英语为母语的外教能给学生展示真实的英语国家文化。	1	2	3	4	5
17	英语作为第二语言国家的英语不够规范。	1	2	3	4	5
18	与我国多数英语教师相比，外教的教学方法更灵活。	1	2	3	4	5
19	交际型教学方式能够凸显学生在学习中的中心地位。	1	2	3	4	5
20	交际型教学方式有助于建构师生间的平等的课堂关系。	1	2	3	4	5
21	交际型教学方式体现了一种先进的教育理念。	1	2	3	4	5
22	英语课堂教学内容应该以英语母语国家文化为依托。	1	2	3	4	5
23	交际型教学方式不适合我国的教育文化。	1	2	3	4	5
24	英语课堂教学内容应该以我国自身的文化为依托。	1	2	3	4	5
25	英语学习者一定要按照英语母语者的文化习俗使用英语。	1	2	3	4	5
26	以英语为母语的外教能给学生展示标准的英语。	1	2	3	4	5

### III 情感倾向（共 5 项）

（此部分为单选题。请根据每个问题后的选项进行选择，并说明原因。）

- 27 以下五位英语教师教学能力相当。您最希望您的学生选哪位老师的课？

教师 A：来自英语母语国家，母语为英语；

教师 B：来自于英语国家，华裔(但不懂汉语)，母语为英语；

教师 C：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，母语为英语；

教师 D：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，英语为第二语言；

教师 E：中国本土英语教师，英语为外语。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 28 以下四套包含不同文化内容英语教材供教师选用，您最希望选用哪套？

教材 A：单纯包括英语母语国家的文化，特别是英美社会文化；

教材 B：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量英语作为第二语言国家的文化内容；

教材 C：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量中国文化内容；

教材 D：反映英语母语国家、英语作为第二语言国家、中国和其它英语作为外语国家文化的内容所占比例大体相当。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 29 以下四类学生，您最希望自己的学生成为哪类学生？

学生 A：语音非常接近英语本族语者，经常被人误认为是英语本族语者；

学生 B：语音接近英语本族语者，有时被人误认为是英语本族语者；

学生 C: 英语语音很清晰, 容易为人理解, 但有明显中国口音;  
学生 D: 中国口音较重, 但不影响与英语本族语者和非英语本族语者交流。  
您的选择:  
原因:

- 30 以下四类英语教学方式, 您最希望采用哪一种?  
方式 A: 当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法 (以学生为中心的教学方);  
方式 B: 我国传统的英语教学方法 (以教师为中心的教学方法);  
方式 C: 以方式 A 为主, 方式 B 为辅;  
方式 D: 以方式 B 为主, 方式 A 为辅。  
您的选择: \_\_\_\_\_  
原因:

- 31 以下有三种类型的英语, 您最希望您的学生学习哪一种?  
英语 A: 英语母语国家的英语;  
英语 B: 英语作为第二语言国家的英语 (例如, 新加坡英语等);  
英语 C: “中国英语” (遵循英语母语者的语法, 但词汇和表达方式具有中国文化特色的英语)。  
您的选择: \_\_\_\_\_  
原因:

#### IV 个人背景

(以下为您的个人基本信息, 请在每项陈述后面的相应数字序号上打勾。)

- |    |          |                               |             |  |
|----|----------|-------------------------------|-------------|--|
| 32 | 性别       | (1) 男                         | (2) 女       |  |
| 33 | 职称类别     | (1) 助教                        | (2) 讲师      | (3) 副教授 (4) 教授                           |
| 34 | 学历类别     | (1) 学士                        | (2) 硕士      | (3) 博士                                   |
| 35 | 高校教龄     | (1) 1-5 年                     | (2) 6-10 年  | (3) 11-15 年<br>(4) 16-20 年 (5) 20 年以上    |
| 36 | 英语国家学习经历 | (1) 有 (如果选择“有”, 请回答下题。) (2) 无 |             |  |
| 37 | 英语国家学习时间 | (1) 1-6 个月                    | (2) 7-12 个月 | (3) 13-18 个月<br>(4) 18-24 个月 (5) 24 个月以上 |

如果您对此研究感兴趣, 希望参加下一步的访谈环节, 请留下您的联系方式。

姓名: \_\_\_\_\_ 邮箱: \_\_\_\_\_  
QQ 号码: \_\_\_\_\_ 手机号码: \_\_\_\_\_

(问卷结束, 感谢您的支持)

## **English version (translated)**

### **Before reading the questionnaire, please pay attention to several concepts.**

- Native English speaking countries refer to the traditional English speaking countries, such as Britain, America, and Canada, etc. English as a second language countries mainly refer to the countries, such as India or Singapore, etc. English as a foreign language countries refer to those, such as China, Japan or Korea, etc.
- “Communicative language teaching approach” mainly refers to the teaching mode that takes the “student-centered”, “teacher as a facilitator” and “task-based activities” as the major route of classroom teaching. It is a teaching mode aimed at improving students’ practical ability of using English.

### **I. Teaching practice (10 items)**

(Please answer the following statements according to your own teaching practice. Numbers 1-3 represent different frequencies, with “1” standing for “hardly”, “2” for “sometimes” and “3” for “often”. Please tick the corresponding number after each statement.)

1	I tell my students that it is not necessary to imitate the pronunciation of native English speakers.	1	2	3
2	I ask my students to imitate the oral expressions of native English speakers.	1	2	3
3	I ask my students to imitate native English speakers’ writing convention.	1	2	3
4	I organize my students to conduct “group work” in class.	1	2	3
5	I lead my students to get used to the communicative language teaching approach.	1	2	3
6	I explain the culture of native English speaking countries in class.	1	2	3
7	I explain the culture of English as a second language countries in class.	1	2	3
8	I tell my students that to learn English is not to acculturate to the culture circle of native English speakers.	1	2	3
9	I tell my students that to learn English is mainly to communicate with nonnative English speakers.	1	2	3
10	I introduce to my students the English varieties used beyond native English speaking countries.	1	2	3

### **II Psychological cognition (15 items)**

(Numbers 1-5 represents respectively your personal viewpoint on each statement, with “1” standing for “strongly disagree”, “2” for “disagree”, “3” for “not sure”, “4” for “agree” and “5” for “strongly agree”. Please tick the corresponding number after each statement.)

11	The English language of native English speaking countries is Standard English.	1	2	3	4	5
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

12	The English language of nonnative English speaking countries is not Standard English.	1	2	3	4	5
13	The English language norms of native English speaking countries should be followed in English language teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Most English language teachers from English as a second language countries have heavy accents.	1	2	3	4	5
15	English language learners must work hard to get rid of the interference of their mother tongue culture.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Native English speaker teachers can demonstrate to students the authentic culture of English speaking countries.	1	2	3	4	5
17	The English language of English as a second language countries is not normative enough.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Compared most Chinese English language teachers foreign English language teachers adopt diverse teaching methods.	1	2	3	4	5
19	The communicative language teaching approach can highlight the central position of students in learning.	1	2	3	4	5
20	The communicative language teaching approach can help to construct an equitable student-teacher relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
21	The communicative language teaching approach represents an advanced education philosophy.	1	2	3	4	5
22	The content of English classroom instruction should be based on the culture of native English speaking countries.	1	2	3	4	5
23	The communicative language teaching does not fit in with the educational culture of China.	1	2	3	4	5
24	The content of English classroom instruction should be based on Chinese culture.	1	2	3	4	5
25	English language learners must follow native-speaker cultural norms in using English.	1	2	3	4	5
26	Native English speaker teachers can demonstrate Standard English to students.	1	2	3	4	5

### III Affective tendency (5 items)

(This section includes multiple-choice questions. Please make your choice according to the answers provided to each question, and then explain your choice.)

- 27 Of the following five English language teachers with almost the same teaching competence, whose class do you expect your students to attend most?

Teacher A: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country

Teacher B: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country, with a Chinese pedigree (but with no knowledge of the Chinese language)

Teacher C: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as his/her first language

Teacher D: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as a second language

Teacher E: a local Chinese English teacher, with English as a foreign language

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:



- 28 If allowed to choose one of the following four sets of English language textbooks with different cultural content, which one would be your first choice?

Textbook A: including merely the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture

Textbook B: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of the culture of English as a second language countries

Textbook C: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of Chinese culture

Textbook D: with the content that reflects cultures of native English speaking countries, English as a second language countries, China and other countries equally distributed

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 29 Of the following four types of students, which one do you expect most your students to be?

Student A: His/her pronunciation is very close to that of a native English speaker. He/she is often taken as a native English speaker.

Student B: His/her pronunciation is close to that of a native English speaker. Sometimes, he/she is taken as a native English speaker.

Student C: His/her English pronunciation is clear and easy to understand. But he/she has a visible Chinese accent.

Student D: He/she has a heavy Chinese accent, but this does not affect his/her communication with (non)native English speakers.

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 30 Of the following four types of teaching approaches, which one do you expect most to adopt?

Approach A: the teaching approach currently popular in native English speaking countries (the student-centered teaching approach)

Approach B: the traditional teaching approach of China (the teacher-centered teaching approach)

Approach C: the approach with A as the main strategy and B as an auxiliary

Approach D: the approach with B as the main strategy and A as an auxiliary

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 31 Of the following three types of English language varieties, which one do you expect most your students to learn?

Variety A: the English language of native English speaking countries

Variety B: the English language of English as a second language country

Variety C: "China English" (an English variety that follows the grammar of native-speaker English but is characterized with Chinese culture in vocabulary and expression)

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

#### IV Personal background

(The following is about your basic information. Please tick the sequential number before each item for selection.)

- 32 Sex (1) Male (2) Female
- 33 Professional rank (1) teaching assistant (2) lecturer (3) associate professor (4) professor
- 34 Academic degree (1) Bachelor (2) Master (3) PhD
- 35 Length of teaching experience at universities (1) 1-5 year(s) (2) 6-10 years (3) 11-15 years (4) 16-20 years (5) above 20 years
- 36 native English speaking countries (1) Yes (2) No  
(If select "Yes", please answer the following questions.)
- 37 Length of study in English speaking (1) 1-6 month(s) (2) 7-12 (3) 13-18 months (4) 18-24 months (5) above 24 months

**If you are interested in this research and want to participate in the follow-up interview, please provide you contact information.**

Name: Email:

QQ: Cell phone:

(This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your support.)

## Appendix 2-B Questionnaire for Teachers (Final) <sup>[21]</sup>

### Chinese version (original)

阅读问卷之前，请注意问卷中所涉及的几个概念

- ❖ 英语母语国家是指英国、美国和加拿大等传统英语国家；英语作为第二语言国家指新加坡、印度等国；英语作为外语国家是指中国、日本、韩国等国。
- ❖ “交际型教学途径”是指以学生为“中心”、教师为“疏导者”，以“任务活动”为课堂教学活动主线，旨在培养学生英语应用能力的课堂教学方式。

### I 教学行为（共 10 项）

（请结合您个人的教学实际情况就下列陈述作答。数字“1-3”分别代表不同的频度：“1”表示“几乎没有”；“2”表示“有时”；“3”表示“经常”。请在每项陈述后面的相应数字上打勾。）

1	我告诉学生没有必要模仿英语母语者的语音。	1	2	3
2	我要求学生模仿英语母语者的口语表达方式。	1	2	3
3	我要求学生模仿英语母语者的写作方式。	1	2	3
4	我在课堂上组织学生进行“小组合作式”的学习活动。	1	2	3
5	我引导学生适应“交际型”课堂教学方式。	1	2	3
6	我在课堂上讲解英语母语国家的文化。	1	2	3
7	我在课堂上讲解英语作为第二语言国家的文化。	1	2	3
8	我告诉学生学习英语不是为了融入英语母语文化圈。	1	2	3
9	我告诉学生学习英语更多是为了与其他非英语母语者交流。	1	2	3
10	我在课堂上介绍英语母语国家之外的英语。	1	2	3

### II 心理认知（共 15 项）

（数字“1-5”分别代表对您个人对每项陈述的看法：“1”表示“强烈不同意”；“2”表示“不同意”；“3”表示“中立”；“4”表示“同意”；“5”表示“强烈同意”。请在每项陈述后面的相应数字上打勾。）

11	与非英语母语国家相比，英语母语国家的英语更标准。	1	2	3	4	5
12	非英语母语国家的英语不易听懂。	1	2	3	4	5

<sup>[21]</sup> This is the final version of the questionnaire for teachers. It is the same as the version used for the second pilot survey, which has proved that the questionnaire is valid, reliable, and ready for use.

13	英语教学中应该遵循英语母语国家的英语标准。	1	2	3	4	5
14	与英语母语者教师相比，多数来自英语作为第二语言国家的英语教师口音很重。	1	2	3	4	5
15	英语学习者一定要努力摆脱母语文化的干扰。	1	2	3	4	5
16	与母语非英语者教师相比，以英语为母语的教师能给学生展示真实的英语国家文化。	1	2	3	4	5
17	英语作为第二语言国家的英语不正宗。	1	2	3	4	5
18	与我国多数英语教师相比，英语母语者教师的教学方法更灵活。	1	2	3	4	5
19	与我国传统英语教学方式相比，交际型教学途径能够调动学生的学习兴趣。	1	2	3	4	5
20	与我国传统英语教学方式相比，交际型教学途径有助于建构师生间平等的课堂关系。	1	2	3	4	5
21	与我国传统英语教学方式相比，交际型教学途径体现了一种先进的教育理念。	1	2	3	4	5
22	英语课堂教学内容应该以英语母语国家文化为依托。	1	2	3	4	5
23	交际型教学途径未必有助于提高学生的英语水平。	1	2	3	4	5
24	英语母语国家的文化是英语的支柱。	1	2	3	4	5
25	英语学习者一定要按照英语母语者的文化习俗使用英语。	1	2	3	4	5
26	与非英语母语者教师相比，以英语为母语的外教能给学生展示标准的英语。	1	2	3	4	5

### III 行为倾向（共5项）

（此部分为单选题。请根据每个问题后的选项进行选择，并说明原因。）

- 27 以下五位英语教师教学能力相当。您最希望您的学生选哪位老师的课？  
 教师 A：来自英语母语国家，母语为英语；  
 教师 B：来自于英语国家，华裔(但不懂汉语)，母语为英语；  
 教师 C：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，母语为英语；  
 教师 D：来自于英语作为第二语言的国家，英语为第二语言；  
 教师 E：中国本土英语教师，英语为外语。  
 您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_  
 原因：\_\_\_\_\_
- 28 以下四套包含不同文化内容英语教材供教师选用，您最希望选用哪套？  
 教材 A：单纯包括英语母语国家的文化，特别是英美社会文化；  
 教材 B：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量英语作为第二语言国家的文化内容；  
 教材 C：侧重英语母语国家，特别是英美社会的文化，但也包括少量中国文化内容；  
 教材 D：反映英语母语国家、英语作为第二语言国家、中国和其它英语作为外语国家文化的内容所占比例大体相当。

您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_

原因：

- 29 以下四类学生，您最希望自己的学生成为哪类学生？  
学生 A：语音非常接近英语本族语者，经常被人误认为是英语本族语者；  
学生 B：语音接近英语本族语者，有时被人误认为是英语本族语者；  
学生 C：英语语音很清晰，容易为人理解，但有明显中国口音；  
学生 D：中国口音较重，但不影响与英语本族语者和非英语本族语者交流。  
您的选择：  
原因：
- 30 以下四类英语教学方式，您最希望采用哪一种？  
方式 A：当前英语母语国家流行的教学方法（以学生为中心的教学方）；  
方式 B：我国传统的英语教学方法（以教师为中心的教学方法）；  
方式 C：以方式 A 为主，方式 B 为辅；  
方式 D：以方式 B 为主，方式 A 为辅。  
您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_
- 31 以下有三种类型的英语，您最希望您的学生哪一种？  
英语 A：英语母语国家的英语；  
英语 B：英语作为第二语言国家的英语（例如，新加坡英语等）；  
英语 C：“中国英语”（遵循英语母语者的语法，但词汇和表达方式具有中国文化特色的英语）。  
您的选择：\_\_\_\_\_
- 原因：

#### IV 个人背景

（以下为您的个人基本信息，请在每项陈述后面的相应数字序号上打勾。）

- |    |          |                             |             |                |
|----|----------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| 32 | 性别       | (1) 男                       | (2) 女       |                |
| 33 | 职称类别     | (1) 助教                      | (2) 讲师      | (3) 副教授 (4) 教授 |
| 34 | 学历类别     | (1) 学士                      | (2) 硕士      | (3) 博士         |
| 35 | 高校教龄     | (1) 1-5 年                   | (2) 6-10 年  | (3) 11-15 年    |
|    |          | (4) 16-20 年                 | (5) 20 年以上  |                |
| 36 | 英语国家学习经历 | (1) 有（如果选择“有”，请回答下题。） (2) 无 |             |                |
| 37 | 英语国家学习时间 | (1) 1-6 个月                  | (2) 7-12 个月 | (3) 13-18 个月   |
|    |          | (4) 18-24 个月                | (5) 24 个月以上 |                |

如果您对此研究感兴趣，希望参加下一步的访谈环节，请留下您的联系方式。

姓名：                    邮箱：  
QQ 号码：                手机号码：

（问卷结束，感谢您的支持）

## **English version (translated)**

### **Before reading the questionnaire, please pay attention to several concepts.**

- Native English speaking countries refer to the traditional English speaking countries, such as Britain, America and Canada, etc. English as a second language countries mainly refer to the countries, such as India or Singapore, etc. English as a foreign language countries refer to those, such as China, Japan or Korea, etc.
- “Communicative language teaching approach” mainly refers to the teaching mode that takes the “student-centered”, “teacher as a facilitator” and “task-based activities” as the major route of classroom teaching. It is a teaching mode aimed at improving students’ practical ability of using English.

## **I Teaching practices (10 items)**

(Please answer the following statements according to your own teaching practice. Numbers 1-3 represent different frequencies, with “1” standing for “hardly”, “2” for “sometimes” and “3” for “often”. Please tick the corresponding number after each statement.)

1	I tell my students that it is not necessary to imitate the pronunciation of native English speakers.	1	2	3
2	I ask my students to imitate the oral expressions of native English speakers.	1	2	3
3	I ask my students to imitate native English speakers’ writing convention.	1	2	3
4	I organize my students to conduct “group work” in class.	1	2	3
5	I lead my students to get used to the communicative language teaching approach.	1	2	3
6	I explain the culture of native English speaking countries in class.	1	2	3
7	I explain the culture of English as a second language countries in class.	1	2	3
8	I tell my students that to learn English is not to acculturate to the culture circle of native English speakers.	1	2	3
9	I tell my students that to learn English is mainly to communicate with nonnative English speakers.	1	2	3
10	I introduce to my students the English varieties used beyond native English speaking countries.	1	2	3

## **II Psychological cognition (15 items)**

(Numbers 1-5 represents respectively your personal viewpoint on each statement, with “1” standing for “strongly disagree”, “2” for “disagree”, “3” for “not sure”, “4” for “agree” and “5” for “strongly agree”. Please tick the corresponding number after each statement.)

11	The English language of native English speaking countries is more standard than that of the nonnative counterparts	1	2	3	4	5
----	--	---	---	---	---	---

12	The English language of nonnative English speaking countries is not easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
13	The English language standard of native English speaking countries should be followed in English language teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Compared with native English speaker teachers, most English language teachers from English as a second language countries have heavy accents.	1	2	3	4	5
15	English language learners must work hard to get rid of the interference of their mother tongue culture.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Compared with nonnative English speaker teachers, native English speaker teachers can demonstrate to students the authentic culture of English speaking countries.	1	2	3	4	5
17	The English language of English as a second language countries is inauthentic.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Compared with most Chinese English language teachers, native English speaker teachers adopt diverse teaching methods.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Compared with the traditional English language teaching mode in China, the communicative language teaching approach can help to stimulate students' learning interests.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Compared with the traditional English language teaching mode in China, the communicative language teaching approach can put students in the center of learning..	1	2	3	4	5
21	Compared with the traditional English language teaching mode in China, the communicative language teaching approach represents a sophisticated education philosophy.	1	2	3	4	5
22	The content of English classroom instruction should be based on the culture of native English speaking countries.	1	2	3	4	5
23	It is uncertain that the communicative language teaching approach helps to improve students' English proficiency.	1	2	3	4	5
24	The culture of native English speaking countries is the pillar of the English language.	1	2	3	4	5
25	English language learners must follow the native-speaker cultural norms in using English.	1	2	3	4	5
26	Compared with nonnative English speaker teachers, native English speaker teachers can demonstrate to students Standard English.	1	2	3	4	5

### III Behavioral tendency (5 items)

(This section includes multiple-choice questions. Please make your choice according to the answers provided to each question, and then explain your choice.)

- 27 Of the following five English language teachers with almost the same teaching competence, whose class do you expect your students to attend most?

Teacher A: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country

Teacher B: a native English speaker from a native English speaking country, with a Chinese pedigree (but with no knowledge of the Chinese language)

Teacher C: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as his/her first language

Teacher D: a person from an English as a second language country, with English as a second language

Teacher E: a local Chinese English teacher, with English as a foreign language

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 28 If allowed to choose one of the following four sets of English language textbooks with different cultural content, which one would be your first choice?

Textbook A: including merely the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture

Textbook B: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of the culture of English as a second language countries

Textbook C: concentrating on the culture of native English speaking countries, particularly Anglo-American culture, but incorporating a small quantity of Chinese culture

Textbook D: with the content that reflects cultures of native English speaking countries, English as a second language countries, China and other countries equally distributed

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 29 Of the following four types of students, which one do you expect most your students to be?

Student A: His/her pronunciation is very close to that of a native English speaker. He/she is often taken as a native English speaker.

Student B: His/her pronunciation is close to that of a native English speaker. Sometimes, he/she is taken as a native English speaker.

Student C: His/her English pronunciation is clear and easy to understand. But he/she has a visible Chinese accent.

Student D: He/she has a heavy Chinese accent, but this does not affect his/her communication with (non)native English speakers.

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 30 Of the following four types of teaching approaches, which one do you expect most to adopt?

Approach A: the teaching approach currently popular in native English speaking countries (the student-centered teaching approach)

Approach B: the traditional teaching approach of China (the teacher-centered teaching approach)

Approach C: the approach with A as the main strategy and B as an auxiliary

Approach D: the approach with B as the main strategy and A as an auxiliary

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

- 31 Of the following three types of English language varieties, which one do you expect most your students to learn?

Variety A: the English language of native English speaking countries

Variety B: the English language of English as a second language country



Variety C: “China English” (an English variety that follows the grammar of native-speaker English but is characterized with Chinese culture in vocabulary and expression)

Your choice: \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons:

#### IV Personal background

(The following is about your basic information. Please tick the sequential number before each item for selection.)

- 32 Sex (1) Male (2) Female
- 33 Professional rank (1) assistant teaching (2) lecturer (3) associate professor (4) professor
- 34 Academic degree (1) Bachelor (2) Master (3) PhD
- 35 Length of teaching at universities (1) 1-5 year(s) (2) 6-10 years (3) 11-15 years (4) 16-20 years (5) above 20 years
- 36 native English speaking countries (1) Yes (2) No  
(If select “Yes”, please answer the following questions.)
- 37 Length of study in English speaking (1) 1-6 month(s) (2) 7-12 (3) 13-18 months (4) 18-24 months (5) above 24 months

**If you are interested in this research and want to participate in the follow-up interview, please provide you contact information.**

Name: Email:

QQ: Cell phone:

(This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your support.)

## Appendix 2-C Cover letter of the Questionnaire for Teachers

### **Chinese version (original)**

我叫刘君栓，河北科技大学外国语学院教师，目前正在攻读利物浦大学英语专业博士学位。我的课题题目为“英语教育中的‘英本主义’：一项关于中国英语教育的个案研究”。

本研究欲以河北省高校英语教育和教学现状为对象。作为河北高校的教师，您所提供的数据和信息将为本研究的顺利开展奠定基础，也将为我省乃至全国高校的英语教育和教学改革提供数据参考

问卷包括实际教学情况、认知态度、情感倾向和个人背景信息四部分内容，旨在了解您对英语教育领域关于“教师母语身份”、“英语标准”、“英语教育文化取向”和“教学途径/方法”等四个维度问题的态度。问卷预计需要半个小时完成。

我将严格遵守科研数据收集和国际惯例，特别是利物浦大学的科研操作和管理的伦理规范，对您所提供的数据采取严格保密措施,并保证参与此项问卷调查活动不会给您带来任何负面影响。如果您有什么问题，请随时联系我。

感谢您的支持和帮助。

调查者：刘君栓

邮箱：liujunshuan@hotmail.com

QQ：2586866424

日期：2014 年 11 月 10 日

### **English version (translated)**

My name is Junshuan Liu, a teacher working at School of Foreign Languages, Hebei University of Science and Technology (HEBUST). I am currently working on the doctoral degree in English at University of Liverpool. The topic of my research project is *Native-speakerism in ELT: A case study of English language education in China*.

This study intends to focus on English language education at higher educational institutes of Hebei province, China. As a university teacher of this province, the data and information that you provide will lay a foundation for the successful operation of this research. They will provide reference for the educational and teaching reform of English language education in Hebei and even the whole country.

The questionnaire consists of four sections, including actual teaching practice, cognitive attitude, affective tendency and personal background information. The survey is targeted at investigating your attitude toward four issues in the realm of English language education regarding teachers' first language backgrounds, English language standard, cultural orientations and teaching approaches/methods. It is expected that questionnaire is to be completed in about 30 minutes.

I will abide by strictly the international practice in relation to data collection and management, particularly the ethics on research conduct and management of University of Liverpool, take strict security measures to protect the data you supply, and guarantee that your participating in this questionnaire survey will not bring about any side effect on you. Should you have any questions, please contact me anytime.

Thank you for your support and help.

Researcher: Junshuan Liu

Email : liujunshuan@hotmail.com

QQ : 2586866424

Data: November 10th, 2014

## Appendix 3 Interview Questions for Students

### Chinese version (original)

- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | 很多人认为，与传统非英语母语国家的英语（例如，印度英语/新加坡英语）相比，英语母语国家的英语（例如，英国英语/美国英语）更标准、正宗、语音清晰易懂。您怎么看待此观点？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 2 | 人们学习英语时，通常以英语母语国家的英语为参照。有些学者认为此行为对非英语母语国家英语意味着一种歧视。您怎么看待这种说法？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 3 | 人们普遍认为，与中国英语老师相比，来自英语母语国家的外教能够给学生提供更真实的英语语言及相关文化。您怎么看待这个观点？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 4 | 一般而言，来自英语母语国家的外教教学方法灵活、课堂氛围活跃。有人认为这与他们的社会文化和教育经历相关。您怎么看待这个观点？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 5 | 您希望学校聘什么样的外教（国别、母语背景、教学经验）？为什么？ |
|---|---------------------------------|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 6 | 一般来说，来自英语母语国家外教的薪水高于同级别中国老师，校方给他们提供更多尊重。您觉得这对中国老师是否意味着一种歧视？为什么？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 7 | 很多人认为要掌握英语必须要学习英语母语国家的文化。您怎样看待这种说法？ |
|---|-------------------------------------|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 8 | 一些学者坚持，我国英语教育强调学习西方英语国家文化，对我国自身文化意味着一种压制或歧视。您是否认同这种观点？为什么？ |
|---|--|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 9 | 很多人认为，西方英语国家以学生为中心的教学方法体现了一种先进的教育理念。课堂教学中使用该方法有利于构建平等的师生关系，并能够调动学生的学习热情。您怎样看待这种说法？ |
|---|--|
- 
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 10 | 您觉得我国教育界大力推行西方以学生为中心的教学方法，对我国的传统教育文化是否意味着一种歧视或者压制？为什么？ |
|----|--|
-

### **English version (translated)**

1	Many people believe that in comparison with the English language varieties of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries (e.g., Indian English/Singaporean English), those of native English speaking countries are more standard, authentic and intelligible in pronunciation (e.g., British/American English). What do you think about this viewpoint?
2	The English language of native English speaking countries is usually taken as the reference in learning English. Some scholars maintain that this practice entails discrimination against the English varieties of nonnative English speaking countries. What is your opinion about this statement?
3	It is generally believed that in comparison with Chinese English language teachers, foreign teachers from native English speaking countries can provide for students the English language and its related culture that are more authentic. What do you think about this opinion?
4	In general, foreign teachers from native English speaking countries adopt diverse teaching methods and their classroom atmosphere is active. Some people believe that these are related to the socioculture and education they have experienced. What do you think about this viewpoint?
5	What type(s) of foreign English language teachers do you expect your university to hire (in terms of nation base, L1 background, race and teaching experience)? What is your reason?
6	Generally speaking, foreign English language teachers from native English speaking countries get higher payment than Chinese English language teachers of the same professional ranks, and the university management accord more respects to them. Are these a type of discrimination against Chinese English language teachers? What is your reason?
7	Many people think that one has to learn the culture of native English speaking countries in order to acquire English? What do you think about this opinion?
8	Some scholars maintain that the emphasis on learning the culture of the English speaking West in China's English language education means an oppression over or a threat to Chinese culture? Do you agree on this viewpoint? What is your reason?
9	Many people believe that the student-centered communicative language teaching method from the English speaking West represents an advanced educational philosophy and the application of this method to classroom teaching is conducive for constructing an equitable student-teacher relationship and stimulating students' enthusiasm in learning. What do you think about this opinion?
10	Do you think that the strong promotion of the Western student-centered teaching approach in China's English language teaching entails a type of discrimination against or an oppression over the traditional education culture of China? What is your reason?

## Appendix 4 Interview Questions for Teachers

### Chinese version (original)

- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | 一些学者认为当前英语的全球化发展，使其成为了一种世界通用语，英语不仅属于英语本族语者。您怎么看待这个观点？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 2 | 您是否认为非传统英语国家的英语变体与美国英语和英国英语处于平等地位？ |
|---|------------------------------------|
- 
- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 3 | 学术界有一种声音，说“中国英语”也是标准英语。您怎么看待这种观点？ |
|---|-----------------------------------|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4 | 有学者说，英语的全球化带来了英语的多元化，英语教学中坚持以某种英语为参照，意味着对其它英语的歧视。你怎么看待这种观点 |
|---|--|
- 
- |   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| 5 | 您怎么看待英语母语国家的文化与英语语言之间的关系？ |
|---|---------------------------|
- 
- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 6 | 我国英语教学特别强调教授和学习西方英语国家文化，您如何看待这种做法？ |
|---|------------------------------------|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 7 | 一些学者认为我国英语教育中强调学习英语母语国家的文化，是对我国自身文化发展的一种威胁或者压制。你怎么看待这种观点？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 8 | 人们普遍认为，与中国英语老师相比，来自英语母语国家的外教能够给学生提供更真实的英语语言和文化知识。您是否认同这个观点？ |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 9 | 与中国英语老师相比，来自英语母语国家外教的教学风格更灵活。您认同这个观点吗？ |
|---|--|
- 
- |    |                     |
|----|---------------------|
| 10 | 您觉得应该聘请什么类型的外籍英语教师？ |
|----|---------------------|
- 
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 11 | 来自英语母语国家的外教通常比中国老师享受更高的薪水和更多的尊重。您觉得这是否是对后者的一种歧视？ |
|----|--|
- 
- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 12 | 与我国传统以教师为中心的教学方式相比，您觉得源自西方英语国家的交际型教学途径是否代表了一种先进的教育理念？ |
|----|---|
- 
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 13 | 我国英语教育界大力推广交际型教学途径，您觉得这对我国传统教育文化是否意味着一种歧视或者压制？ |
|----|--|
-

### **English version (translated)**

- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | Some scholars believe that the current globalization of the English language has made it become a global lingua franca and therefore English does not only belong to native English speakers. What do you think about this point of view? |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 2 | Do you think whether the English varieties of traditionally nonnative English speaking countries are equal in status to British and American English? |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 3 | There is a voice in the academia claiming that China English is also Standard English. What is your opinion about it? |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4 | Some scholars maintain that the globalization of the English language has resulted in its pluralization and that the insistence on one English variety as the reference in English language teaching entails discrimination against other English varieties. What is your opinion? about this viewpoint? |
|---|--|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 5 | What do you think about the relations between the culture of English speaking countries and the English language? |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 6 | What do you think about the practice that lays strong emphasis on teaching/learning the culture of the English speaking West in China's English language education? |
|---|---|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 7 | Some scholars maintain that the emphasis on learning the culture of the English speaking countries in China's English language education is a threat to or an oppression over the development of Chinese culture. What is your opinion about this viewpoint? |
|---|--|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 8 | It is generally believed that in comparison with Chinese English language teachers, the English language provided by foreign teachers from native English speaking countries are more authentic. What do you think about this opinion? |
|---|--|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 9 | Foreign teachers from native English speaking countries are claimed to adopt diverse teaching methods. Do you agree with this viewpoint? |
|---|--|
- 
- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 10 | In your opinion, what type(s) of foreign English language teachers should be hired? |
|----|---|
- 
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 11 | Foreign teachers from native English speaking countries usually get higher payment and greater respect than Chinese English language teachers. Do you think this is discrimination against the latter? |
|----|--|
- 
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 12 | Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, do you think that communicative language teaching (CLT) stemming from the English speaking West represents a modern education philosophy? |
|----|--|
- 
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 13 | Do you think whether the strong promotion of CLT in China's ELT entails a type of discrimination against or an oppression over the traditional education culture of China? |
|----|--|
-

## Appendix 5 Interview Questions for Administrators

### Chinese version (original)

- 
- 1 您认为为什么要聘用英语母语者教师来中国教英语?
  - 2 您觉得英语母语者教师和中国英语老师在教学风格方面有什么不同?
  - 3 您觉得应该聘请什么类型的外籍英语教师?
  - 4 此五类教师，内圈国家英语母语者，外圈国家英语母语者，外圈国家英语作为第二语言者，中国英语教师，内圈英语为母语的华裔，您希望学生们跟谁学英语?
  - 5 英语母语者教师普遍比中国老师薪水高，更受尊重。您觉得这是否是对后者的一种歧视?
  - 6 学术界有一种声音，说“中国英语”也是标准英语。您怎么看待这种观点?
  - 7 您觉得为什么很多人仅认为英美两国的英语是标准英语?
  - 8 作为管理者，您是否要求你们部门或者系的老师教授某一种类型的英语?
  - 9 很多学者认为，英语的全球化带来了英语的多元化，英语教学中坚持以某种英语为参照，意味着对其它英语的歧视。您怎么看待这种观点?
  - 10 我国英语教学特别强调教授和学习西方英语国家文化，您如何看待这种做法?
  - 11 仅从英语教学本身来讲，您最希望英语教材体现哪类国家的文化?
  - 12 我国英语教学强调教授和学习西方英语国家文化，特别是英美文化。您觉得这是否会压制我国自身文化或者对其构成威胁?
  - 13 与我国传统以教师为中心的教学方式相比，您觉得源自西方英语国家的交际型教学途径是否代表了一种现代教育理念?
  - 14 作为管理者，您是否建议或要求你们的老师在课堂教学中要从以教师为中心的教学方式转向交际型的教学模式?
  - 15 我国英语教育界大力推广交际型教学途径，您觉得这对我国传统教育文化是否意味着一种歧视或者压制?
-



### **English version (translated)**

1	Do you think why native English language speaker teachers are hired to teach English in China?
2	What differences do you think existing between NESTs and Chinese English language teachers in instructional style?
3	In your opinion, what type(s) of foreign English language teachers should be hired?
4	Of the four types of teachers – Inner Circle native English speaker, Outer Circle native English speaker, Outer Circle English as a second language speaker, Chinese English language teacher, Inner Circle native English speaker with a Chinese pedigree, which one do you expect your students to learn English with?
5	NESTs usually get higher payment and greater respect than Chinese English language teachers. Do you think this is discrimination against the latter?
6	There is a voice in the academia claiming that China English is also Standard English. What is your opinion about it?
7	In your opinion, why do many people only regard British and American English as Standard English?
8	As a program administrator, do you require the teachers of your division or department to teach a certain English variety?
9	Many scholars maintain that the globalization of the English language has resulted in its pluralization and that the adherence to one English variety as the reference in English language teaching entails discrimination against other English varieties. What is your opinion about this viewpoint?
10	What do you think about the practice that lays strong emphasis on teaching/learning the culture of the English speaking West in China's English language education?
11	In terms of English language teaching itself, which country's culture do you expect most to be represented in English language textbooks?
12	English language education in China emphasizes learning/teaching the culture of the English speaking West, particularly Anglo-American culture. Do you think whether this practice will generate an oppression over or constitute a threat to the development of Chinese culture?
13	Compared with the traditional teacher-centered teaching approach in China, do you think that communicative language teaching (CLT) stemming from the English speaking West represents a modern education philosophy?
14	As a program administrator, do you recommend or require your fellow teachers to shift from the traditional teacher-centered approach to CLT in classroom teaching?
15	Do you think whether the strong promotion of CLT in China's ELT entails a type of discrimination against or an oppression over the traditional education culture of China?